



HARVARD COLLEGE  
LIBRARY



GIFT OF THE  
GOVERNMENT  
OF THE UNITED STATES









INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE  
ST. LOUIS, MO., AREA—PART 4

---

HEARING  
BEFORE THE  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

---

JUNE 8, 1956

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

(INCLUDING INDEX)



HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY  
DEPOSITED BY THE  
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT  
OCT 5 1956

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1956

## COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

### UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

RICHARD ARENS, *Director*



# CONTENTS

---

## Executive Hearings (See Pt. 3),<sup>1</sup>

June 2, 1956: Testimony of—	<b>Page</b>
Joseph John Schoemehl.....	4949
Loyal Hammack.....	4966
George V. L. Hardy.....	4971
June 4, 1956: Testimony of—	
Joseph John Schoemehl (resumed).....	4979
Obadiah Jones.....	4981

## Public Hearings

### PART 1

June 4, 1956: Testimony of—	
William W. Cortor.....	4724
Afternoon session:	
William W. Cortor (resumed).....	4758
James H. Sage.....	4761
Elliott Waxman.....	4784
Leslie S. Davison.....	4793
Sol S. Nissen.....	4794
John William Simpson.....	4798

### PART 2

June 5, 1956: Testimony of—	
John William Simpson (resumed).....	4803
William Henry Holland.....	4808
Harvey John Day.....	4818
Thelma Hecht (Mrs. Julius Hecht).....	4825
Brockman Schumacher.....	4829
Thomas A. Younglove.....	4834
Afternoon session:	
Thomas A. Younglove (resumed).....	4845
Orville Leach.....	4864
Zollie C. Carpenter.....	4869
James Payne.....	4876
Helen Aukamp Sage (Mrs. James H. Sage).....	4883

### PART 3

June 6, 1956: Testimony of—	
Dr. Sol Londe.....	4889
William Edwin Davis.....	4895
Ida Holland (Mrs. William Henry Holland).....	4899
Edwin Leslie Richardson.....	4902
Anne (Ann) Yasgur Kling.....	4912
Afternoon session:	
Anne (Ann) Yasgur Kling (Resumed).....	4920
Gilbert Harold Hall.....	4940
Richard L. Stanford.....	4944
Romey Hudson.....	4945

<sup>1</sup> Released by the committee August 24, 1956 and ordered to be printed.

## PART 4

June 8, 1956: Testimony of—	<b>Page</b>
Helen Musiel.....	4993
Hershel James Walker.....	5000
George Kimmel.....	5004
Hershel James Walker (recalled).....	5014
Linus E. Wampler.....	5017
George Kimmel (recalled).....	5026
Afternoon session:	
Dr. John F. Rutledge.....	5028
Ella Mae Posey Pappademos.....	5051
Clara Perkins (Mrs. Haven Perkins).....	5058
Haven Perkins.....	5065
Julius Hecht.....	5069
Sol Derman.....	5070
Douglas MacLeod.....	5072
Index.....	i

## PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress (1946), chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, \* \* \**

### PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

#### RULE X

##### SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

#### RULE XI

##### POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.  
(A) Un-American Activities.  
(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

# RULES ADOPTED BY THE 84TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 5, 1955

\* \* \* \* \*

## RULE X

### STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress:

\* \* \* \* \*

(a) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

\* \* \* \* \*

## RULE XI

### POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

# INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE ST. LOUIS, MO., AREA—PART 4

FRIDAY, JUNE 8, 1956

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*St. Louis, Mo.*

## PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 9:55 a. m., pursuant to recess, in courtroom No. 3, United States Courthouse and Customs Building, St. Louis, Mo., Hon. Morgan M. Moulder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Morgan M. Moulder, of Missouri, and Gordon H. Scherer, of Ohio.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George C. Williams and Raymond T. Collins, investigators.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Call your first witness, please, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Helen M. Musiel.

Will you come forward, please.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you stand there, please. Will you hold up your right hand and be sworn, please.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Miss MUSIEL. I do.

Mr. MOULDER. Be seated, please.

## TESTIMONY OF HELEN MUSIEL, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, R. L. WITHERSPOON

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Miss MUSIEL. Helen Musiel.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that the witness is accompanied by Mr. Witherspoon as her attorney.

Where were you born?

Miss MUSIEL. St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you single or married?

Miss MUSIEL. Single.

Mr. TAVENNER. Musiel is your maiden name?

Miss MUSIEL. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Miss MUSIEL. Chicago, Ill.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you resided in Chicago?

Miss MUSIEL. About 6 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your address in Chicago?

Miss MUSIEL. 424 South Central Park.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you reside prior to your moving to Chicago 6 months ago?

Miss MUSIEL. St. Louis, Mo.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. How long had you resided in St. Louis?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Miss MUSIEL. I was born here.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean you had lived here continuously up until the period of about 6 months ago?

Miss MUSIEL. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. What periods of time did you reside outside of St. Louis?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that. I invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that because you were in the underground of the Communist Party and that you left St. Louis in order that your identity be preserved?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that. I invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you live in Kansas City under an assumed name?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you go to Kansas City to live?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Under what names have you lived other than the name Helen Musiel?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a document which was read in evidence, entitled "Proposed Plan for Missouri State Party Building Conference, May 2, 3, 1946."

Various groups of the Communist Party were named in this document as organizations in which groups of the Communist Party were to be organized, including the names of those who were to take the leadership in the recruiting from those groups. Among them I find packing, packinghouse, which is referred to as packing, and following the name packing is the name Helen.

Were you assigned to the position of doing this special recruiting in 1946 from persons employed in the packinghouse industry?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that. I invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become the leader of a group of persons employed in a packinghouse who were members of the Communist Party?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. A person by the name of Ann Yasgur Kling was a witness before this committee, and testified that she worked in the district office of the Communist Party in St. Louis. Did you work in the district office of the Communist Party in St. Louis during the period of time that she worked there?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not Ann Yasgur during any of the period of her membership in the



Communist Party was a leader in the professional group of the Communist Party in St. Louis?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that question—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a functionary of the Communist Party in St. Louis at any time between 1944 and 1948?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that question—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said you went to Chicago about 6 months ago. Did you go there from St. Louis?

Miss MUSIEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you transferred there for work in the Communist Party by the Communist Party organization?

Miss MUSIEL. No, I wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not.

What employment have you had in Chicago since you went there 6 months ago?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been engaged in Communist Party activities in Chicago within the past 6 months?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your reason for going to Chicago?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you state you were not transferred there by the Communist Party?

Miss MUSIEL. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that right?

Miss MUSIEL. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your Communist Party membership transferred from St. Louis to Chicago?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why did you leave St. Louis?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. What income do you have, witness?

Miss MUSIEL. What is that?

Mr. SCHERER. What income do you have?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you receive a salary?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer that question whether she receives a salary. It couldn't possibly incriminate her.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Miss MUSIEL. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time serve on the review commission of the Communist Party in St. Louis?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Joseph Schoemehl?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Tavenner, part of the duties of the review commission, as I understand it, was to impose discipline upon members of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you desire to give some explanation of the duties of the review commission?

Miss MUSIEL. No, I didn't. I was just listening to him.

Mr. TAVENNER. I thought I heard you say something.

Miss MUSIEL. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. You didn't?

Miss MUSIEL. No.

Mr. SCHERER. She wanted to correct me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you desire to correct my statement to the member of the committee as to the duties of the review commission of the Communist Party? Because I am certain you started to say something.

Miss MUSIEL. I didn't start to say anything. I was just listening. I have nothing to say on that.

Mr. SCHERER. You heard right, Mr. Tavenner, because I heard it. And she was properly stopped by her counsel.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask this question:

Do you have any knowledge or information concerning un-American or communistic activities with which you are not directly connected? Giving information on such activity would not incriminate you.

Miss MUSIEL. I have no knowledge at all.

If you want un-American activities I think——

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. You say you have no such knowledge?

Miss MUSIEL. No.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. Well, do you have any knowledge of Communist Party activities existing at the present time?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you have any knowledge of any subversive activities?

Miss MUSIEL. No, I don't.

Mr. MOULDER. In your opinion would Communist Party activities be subversive?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. You realize, don't you, Miss Musiel, that the courts of our country have found and decided that the Communist Party of the United States is a part of an international conspiracy to dominate all democracies and non-Communist countries?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Miss MUSIEL. I am not too familiar with the court decisions.

Mr. MOULDER. But if you did know that and if you were informed and advised of that then would you not consider the Communist Party activities in this country as being subversive?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer—fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to read to you, Miss Musiel, an excerpt from the testimony of Mr. Schoemehl given in executive session to this subcommittee last Saturday. I had asked Mr. Schoemehl to describe the circumstances under which he was called before a review commission of the Communist Party, and this is his testimony:

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. About in December, as a rule, every year they would have a, well, sort of a questionnaire. You would be asked to tell about where you worked and how much you made, because you are supposed to pay 10 percent of your salary as dues, and questions of that sort. What work you had done for the party during the past year. I forget what they called that. At any rate,



on that was based whether or not you would receive your party card for the following year. But sometimes they would call you in any time during the year. And they called me in along about in May and asked me those questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Can you recall who called you in?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Helen Musiel phoned me. And Jim Forrest, Romey Hudson, and Helen Musiel were the ones who questioned me. Ray Koch had been the head of the review commission up to the last that I heard. But he was in Chicago then and had been transferred to Chicago, or at least had gone to Chicago. And after the questions and up to almost the very last minute nothing was said about this being a review commission. But then after these notes had been brought out—

And let me explain those were notes which he was detected taking during the course of a Communist Party meeting—

then Jim Forrest advised me that this was a session of the review commission and they would render their decision.

Is there any statement or reference made by Mr. Schoemehl in that testimony which affects you untrue?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer—fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Continuing with the testimony:

Mr. MOULDER. Can you give us more identification of Helen Musiel, her occupation and so forth?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. She was a packinghouse worker. And she was very active in the party activities when I first joined the Communist Political Association. She was more or less in charge, she and Sarah Kling—Sarah Shaw, pardon me.

Were you employed in the packinghouse, as a packinghouse worker?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Tavenner, could I interrupt a minute?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Would you go back to the first part of Mr. Schoemehl's testimony where he said what questions were asked him on this questionnaire before the commission? You said something—they would call you in during the year occasionally.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I have it.

Mr. SCHERER. Take it slowly.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

You would be asked to tell about where you worked and how much you made, because you are supposed to pay 10 percent of your salary as dues, and questions of that sort. What work you had done for the party during the past year.

Mr. SCHERER. That is enough.

In this disciplinary commission of the party they ask the same questions or similar questions to the ones we asked this morning. Now when those questions were asked a member of the Communist Party as to where he worked, how much he made, what work he had done for the party, you made them answer those questions, did you not?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. They weren't allowed to invoke the fifth amendment before that review commission as you have been invoking the fifth amendment to the same questions a committee of your Congress was asking you this morning. Isn't that right?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. And if they refused to answer the questions they were expelled from the Communist Party. Right?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. And if they attempted to invoke the fifth amendment, if such a thing were even thought of, they would be expelled from the party; would they not?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. That is all I have.

There is a difference.

Before the commission he had to answer the very questions she was asked. This morning she refused to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of Mr. Schoemehl's appearance before the committee I asked him several questions regarding the Joseph Weydemeyer School. My question was this:

You have told us about the Basic Training Institute. Was there any other course of training made available to members of the Communist Party in this area?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Well, they had the Joseph Weydemeyer School of Social Science. But it was not confined strictly to party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, it operated on about the same principle as the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, sir. They used the same textbooks that they used there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend this school?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us the year in which that occurred?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Just off hand, I can't remember. There were several sessions of it, that is, in several years there. About 2½ years that I remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the instructors as far as you can now recall?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. There was Jim Forrest, Dorothy Forrest, Ray Koch—Nathan Oser was at one of those. He was really not an instructor. He merely appeared at one of the sessions. Al Murphy, Bob Manewitz.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are those all that you can now recall?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Those are the only ones I can recall off hand.

Mr. MOULDER. Where were the sessions of the classes held of the Weydemeyer school?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. At the Communist Party headquarters, 1041a North Grand Avenue. You see, each of these instructors had a separate class, and I did not attend all of the classes. That is, I picked out certain classes that I attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe each of those named by you as instructors in the Joseph Weydemeyer School were also instructors in the Basic Training Institute?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Most of them were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any instructor in the Joseph Weydemeyer School, as far as you can remember, not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. To the best of my knowledge, there was none but Communist Party members that I know offhand.

Did you attend the Weydemeyer School?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what the purpose of the Communist Party was in assigning certain of its members to underground activities?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer that—same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have refused to answer a question as to whether or not you went to Kansas City where you worked under an assumed name as part of an underground directive of the Communist Party. But then at a later time you went to Chicago, about 6 months ago.

Now, the committee has found out from its investigation in different places in the country—very recently in North Carolina and in other places—that persons who had been in the underground of the Communist Party are now coming out from underground; they are assuming their real names; they are being active again in the Communist Party.

Will you enlighten the committee on that from any information that you have on that subject?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer—the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it not true that many of those who have been underground in the Communist Party now for a period of time are, in fact, coming out and becoming actively engaged in Communist Party activities now?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer; the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't that true in your own case?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer; same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you very active in the raising of funds for the defense of the 12—

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. The 12 who were the first tried under the Smith Act case in New York?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer; the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you raise substantial funds in St. Louis that went to Ben Gold in New York City for use in the defense of the Smith Act defendants?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer; the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party now?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer; the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions. I just have this observation to make, Mr. Chairman:

From the testimony of Mr. Schoemehl, which we heard on last Saturday in executive session, together with the testimony of this witness, it appears that the Communist Party set up these review or disciplinary commissions which met from time to time and questioned members of the Communist Party in detail, asking them the same type questions that we ask of this witness called before us in these hearings. They held these hearings to determine whether or not those members of the party were loyal to the party, whether they had followed the party line.

We have got this same group of individuals.

Of course, as I pointed out here, there was no chance of invoking the fifth amendment before those disciplinary commissions. They would either answer the questions or else.

Now these same people and many of their followers throughout the country who are not members of the party object seriously when we ask these same individuals these same questions to determine not their loyalty to the party but to determine their loyalty to this country.

I just want to make that observation in connection with the testimony of Schoemehl and this witness.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Did you answer the question as to the reason you changed your residence from St. Louis to Chicago?

Miss MUSIEL. What was that?

Mr. MOULDER. Was that question asked you?

Miss MUSIEL. Yes; it was asked.

Mr. MOULDER. What cause did you say moved you from St. Louis to Chicago, and what was your answer?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer; the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you now engaged in any illegal occupation or work in the city of Chicago?

Miss MUSIEL. I refuse to answer; fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Very well.

Any other questions?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hershel Walker.

Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn, please.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WALKER. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF HERSEL JAMES WALKER, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, R. L. WITHERSPOON

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name?

Mr. WALKER. Hershel James Walker.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted for the record that the same counsel is appearing with this witness as the former witness.

When and where were you born, Mr. Walker?

Mr. WALKER. February 20, 1909, Forrest City, Ark.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. WALKER. 1382 Arlington, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice a little. It is rather difficult to hear.

By whom are you now employed?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. Wagner Electric Corp.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been employed there?

Mr. WALKER. About 14 years.

Mr. SCHERER. Would the witness repeat his address. I didn't hear it and I don't think the press did.

Mr. WALKER. 1382 Arlington, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you say you had been employed at Wagner Electric?

Mr. WALKER. About 14 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. 14 years.

How do you spell your first name?

Mr. WALKER. H-e-r-s-h-e-l.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you hold any official position or occupation of any type in the union which has bargaining rights at Wagner Electric?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever held a position—in a union having bargaining rights at Wagner Electric?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have here a letter addressed by you, purportedly addressed by you to the membership of your union. Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not the signature appearing on the letter is your signature.



(Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. I will refuse to answer that—

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your answer, please?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. What was the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question was whether or not the signature appearing at the bottom of the letter is your signature.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer; it might tend to incriminate me. On the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I ask that the document be marked "Walker Exhibit No. 1" for identification only.

Mr. MOULDER. The document referred to will be so marked.

(The document referred to was marked "Walker Exhibit No. 1," and filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. This letter is addressed to "Dear Brothers and Sisters." That referred to the membership of your local union, did it not?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. The letter states, in part:

The Negro Labor Council of St. Louis is sponsoring a meeting November 25th, 1951, at 2 P. M. for the delegates who went to the National Convention of the Negro Labor Council that was held in Cincinnati, Ohio, on October 27 and 28, 1951.

We ask that you inform your membership that they are invited to come to this meeting at which the report on the national convention's activities will be discussed.

Also we hope you will send an official delegate from your local union to attend this meeting.

Fraternally yours,

H. WALKER,  
*Secretary, St. Louis Labor Council.*

Will you tell us what the St. Louis Labor Council was in 1951.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. I decline to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't it a legitimate labor organization here in the city of St. Louis?

Mr. WALKER. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or was it?

You refuse to answer?

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you one of the delegates who attended the founding convention of the National Negro Labor Council?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. You became an official of that organization in the city of St. Louis; did you not?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. The local chapter of the National Negro Labor Council of St. Louis was organized and established by the Communist Party; wasn't it?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. You at that time were a member of the Communist Party; weren't you?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. MOULDER. In the beginning of your testimony you stated that you did not hold any official position in the group, the first group referred to by Mr. Tavenner in his question.

Is that still the position you take? In any answer you wish to make?

Mr. WALKER. I didn't understand you.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you secretary of the organization referred to in the letter which Mr. Tavenner read a moment ago?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the State board of the Communist Party for the State of Missouri?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Where did you say you were employed at the present time?

Mr. WALKER. Wagner Electric.

Mr. SCHERER. Do they have any defense contracts?

Mr. WALKER. I don't know.

Mr. SCHERER. Does Wagner have any defense contracts?

Mr. WALKER. I wouldn't know.

Mr. SCHERER. What type of work do you do with Wagner Electric? (The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. I am the oven operator.

Mr. SCHERER. What is an oven operator?

Mr. WALKER. It is an oven that gets hot. And it bakes paint on whatever part you want to paint.

Mr. SCHERER. Bakes what?

Mr. WALKER. Paint on parts for motors.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know whether your company makes any security checks on its employees?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. You shook your head. You don't know or they do not?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. I don't know.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you file an application for employment for this position with Wagner Electric?

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. How long ago was that?

Mr. WALKER. 14 years ago.

Mr. SCHERER. You have been there 14 years. How old are you now?

Mr. WALKER. Forty-seven.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you a member of the CIO Council between 1945 and 1947 at the time that Mr. Younglove was also a member of it?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not?

Have you at any time been a delegate to the CIO Council?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. Never have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time attend any of its meetings?

Mr. WALKER. Never did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mr. Younglove?  
(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. Ask the question again.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mr. Younglove?

Mr. WALKER. No; I am not acquainted with him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mr. Cortor?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Cortor testified that he served with you on the St. Louis Defense Committee in the work of the St. Louis Defense Committee. Was he correct in that testimony?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Cortor also testified that he worked with you in the Negro Labor Council. Was he correct in that?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me the April 12, 1948, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in which appear the names of members of the State Committee of the Wallace Third Party, referred to here as Progressive Party candidates. And from the 13th District the appointees to the State committee appear here as Hershel Walker, Ray Wolverson, and another person whose name has not been mentioned in connection with Communist activities, and, therefore, I shall not name that person. And a Miss Hauber.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you were acquainted with Miss Hauber?

Mr. WALKER. Will you state your question again?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether you were acquainted with Miss Hauber?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Ray Wolverson?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did either or both of those persons serve with you as a member of the State committee of the Progressive Party in 1948?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the State committee from the 13th District?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now the head of the industrial section of the State board of the Communist Party in Missouri?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time that I have not specifically inquired about?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. MOULDER. I have just one. I am curious to know.

You say that you are 47 years of age?

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. And that you started your employment or work at Wagner Electric 14 years ago?

Mr. WALKER. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. At that time then you would have been 33 years of age.

Mr. WALKER. I would have to count. Right now I wouldn't know offhand.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you serve in the Armed Forces?

Mr. WALKER. No.

Mr. MOULDER. How old were you in 1942?

Mr. WALKER. How old was I in 1942?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. I was born in 1909.

Mr. MOULDER. That would be 33 years of age in 1942 then.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. Were you working for Wagner Electric at that time?

Mr. WALKER. I was.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you deferred from military service because of your employment in that plant?

Mr. WALKER. They didn't say that. They just sent me a card and put me in 2-B. You probably know what that is; I don't know.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you married at that time?

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. How many dependents did you have at that time?

Mr. WALKER. Four. I had four children and a wife. It would be five.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Did you want to have a recess? Would it help to give the reporter an opportunity to rest?

The committee will stand in recess for 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder and Scherer.)

(The subcommittee was reconvened at the expiration of the recess, there being present Representatives Moulder and Scherer.)

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Call your next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. George Kimmel, will you come forward, please, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Please hold up your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. KIMMEL. I do.

# TESTIMONY OF GEORGE KIMMEL, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, JOSEPH COHN

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, sir.

Mr. KIMMEL. George Kimmel.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel: Will counsel please identify himself for the record.

Mr. COHN. Joseph Cohn, C-o-h-n, Missouri and Illinois bar.



Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Kimmel?

Mr. KIMMEL. In St. Louis, in 1908.

Mr. TAVENNER. What date?

Mr. KIMMEL. 1908, October 10.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. KIMMEL. I went to grade school and had completed 2 years of high school.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. KIMMEL. Ste. Genevieve, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Ste. Genevieve?

Mr. KIMMEL. Since about the middle of 1937.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are you now employed?

Mr. KIMMEL. I am not employed.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your last employment?

Mr. KIMMEL. At the Mississippi Lime Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. KIMMEL. October 16, 1954 or 1955.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that at Ste. Genevieve?

Mr. KIMMEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you employed by Mississippi Lime Co.?

Mr. KIMMEL. Since 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to 1947 what was your employment?

Mr. KIMMEL. I resigned and worked on the farm I have in St. Genevieve County.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over how long a period of time did you operate the farm without other outside employment?

Mr. KIMMEL. About 2½ years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that 2½-year period what was your employment?

Mr. KIMMEL. I worked at the Mississippi Lime Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. During what years?

Mr. KIMMEL. From, I believe, April of 1938 until 1944; sometime in 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period of time that you worked for Mississippi Lime Co. was it organized by labor?

Mr. KIMMEL. It was.

Mr. TAVENNER. What union had the bargaining rights during that period?

Mr. KIMMEL. Well, the first period that I worked there, it was the AFL. I believe it is quarry workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Quarry workers. That is from 1938 to 1944?

Mr. KIMMEL. Right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. And then the second period?

Mr. KIMMEL. Mine, mill, and smelter workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any official position in the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers?

Mr. KIMMEL. No, not at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, at any time.

Mr. KIMMEL. I have at times been an international representative in the area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us during what period of time you were international representative of Mine, Mill, and Smelter.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. In 1953.

What I was questioning my attorney about was——

Mr. TAVENNER. You needn't tell us. You have a perfect right to confer with counsel at any time without any explanation.

Mr. KIMMEL. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date?

Mr. KIMMEL. In the period of part of 1953. I don't know exactly when I was——

Mr. TAVENNER. That is, you became international representative of Mine, Mill, and Smelter, in 1953?

Mr. KIMMEL. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And for how long a period of time?

Mr. KIMMEL. That is what I wanted to tell you about. It is just a short period of time. See, I was able to go to another local from my own and assist the people in that local with the grievance procedure. That is merely—that is the only connection I had as a representative.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Had the Mine, Mill and Smelter been expelled from the CIO at that time?

Mr. KIMMEL. Yes, I believe they had.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you president of Local 883 of Mine, Mill and Smelter?

Mr. KIMMEL. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. KIMMEL. I can't recall each year because there was a time when someone else was president, elected to it. But I believe for a period of 5 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. During approximately what period of time?

Mr. KIMMEL. I believe one period was in 1948, starting in the latter part of the year because of the resignation of the first president elected. And 1949, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was before the Mine, Mill and Smelters were expelled from the CIO. Isn't that correct?

Mr. KIMMEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say that you met with grievance committees. Was that part of your duty?

Mr. KIMMEL. My duty was to meet with the grievance committee when they were with the company in grievance procedure.

Mr. TAVENNER. In performing that work did you become acquainted with a person by the name of Philip Koritz, K-o-r-i-t-z?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I did meet him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where Mr. Koritz was from?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. No, I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his employment with Mine, Mill and Smelter?

Mr. KIMMEL. Well, at the time he was international representative, as far as I know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time?

Mr. KIMMEL. I can't say exactly because I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't it during the period of time that you were president of your local?

Mr. KIMMEL. It can possibly be. I wouldn't say.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1948 and 1949?

Mr. KIMMEL. I only knew him for a short while, or met him while he was in for a short period. So I don't recall exactly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Philip Koritz was a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. To my personal knowledge, he wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. To your personal knowledge he was not?

Mr. KIMMEL. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean he was not identified with the Communist Party at Ste. Genevieve?

Mr. KIMMEL. No, he was not identified to me as a Communist by anyone.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party in North Carolina and engaged in Communist Party activities there?

Mr. KIMMEL. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or in Boston?

Mr. KIMMEL. I don't know that either.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Koritz was shown by testimony before the committee, by a number of persons, to have been an active worker in the Communist Party in Boston. He was subpoenaed before this committee about a year ago in connection with his activities in the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case. He refused to testify on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate him.

But both verbal testimony and documentary evidence were produced at that hearing showing the payment of funds to him by the national organization of that committee that I mentioned, as well as his participation in Communist Party activities, one of which was to be one of the leaders in the organization of that committee in Boston.

The committee for some time has been making a study of activities of the Communist Party within the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union. This was particularly true in its hearing held in Denver May 14.

I want to ask you questions relating to Communist Party activities within the Mine, Mill, and Smelter at Ste. Genevieve while you held the various positions with that union.

Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time while you held a position in the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. What dates are you referring to?

Mr. TAVENNER. At any time.

Mr. KIMMEL. At any time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KIMMEL. Well, I have signed the non-Communist affidavit, and I believe that—

Mr. TAVENNER. I know you have, sir. That was in 1952. But my question was whether you have been a Communist Party member at any time.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. COHN. Is there a question before him at this time?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. COHN. Would you repeat it, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. The question was:

Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time while holding any of the positions which you say you have held in the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I will refuse to answer that question under the privilege granted me under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you indicated that at one time you signed an affidavit, the non-Communist affidavit required by law under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Do you recall how many times you signed such an affidavit?

Mr. KIMMEL. No; I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have 2 photostatic copies of such affidavits, one bearing date of February 27, 1952, and another bearing the date of May 4, 1953. Will you examine them, please, and state whether or not they are the affidavits which you signed?

(Documents handed to the witness and his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. The affidavit under date of February 27 is marked for identification as "Kimmel Exhibit No. 1." And the other is marked for identification as "Kimmel Exhibit No. 2," to be filed for the information of the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. So ordered.

Mr. COHN. Pardon me. You said May 27. Is that what you mean? Or February 27?

Mr. TAVENNER. February 27 for the first one, and May 4 for the second one.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. COHN. Pardon me. Is there a question now?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Will you identify those documents as the non-Communist affidavits signed by you?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. They appear to be the affidavits.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on February 27, 1952, the date of the signing of the first affidavit?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on June 1, 1952?

Mr. KIMMEL. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on January 1, 1950?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer under the privilege granted me under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. January 1, 1951?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. For the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. You refuse to answer?

Mr. KIMMEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. So sometime between January 1, 1951, and January 1, 1952, there was a change in your situation, was there not, with respect to the Communist Party?



(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of that change?

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. No.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask how do you distinguish between your not being a member of the Communist Party and being a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I don't know, sir. I have been in this courtroom for a couple of days now listening to the testimony, and I don't get the drift of how do you identify yourself as belonging to the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. Well, there are some people, according to our information and investigations that have been conducted and testimony that has been heard before the committee, who sometimes take the position that after they cease to be a dues-paying member and are removed from the active membership rolls, that they are then justified in saying that they are no longer a member of the Communist Party when, in fact and in truth insofar as their philosophy and sympathy and cooperation with the Communist Party activities are concerned, they remain the same.

I was asking you the question as to whether or not you desire to give any explanation of why you ceased to be a member of the Communist Party, if you so did cease to be a member of the Communist Party.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. Well, I can't quite understand your explanation of it, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. I am asking you for the explanation.

Mr. KIMMEL. Well, you are telling me, didn't you, what constitutes membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. MOULDER. No. I say that is the interpretation and reasoning that some people give. You are here now as a witness and are given the opportunity of making a very patriotic and loyal American citizenship explanation of why you left the Communist Party, if you so desire to take advantage of that opportunity.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. If you have actually left the Communist Party.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. Sir, that explanation that you have given is still just a little beyond my comprehension. And, so, I will say this: that I have never said that I was a member of the Communist Party or that I left it. And so, with the inference that your question poses, I invoke the fifth amendment, which is for the innocent as well as the guilty.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, did I understand you in answering Mr. Tavenner's question as to your present membership in the Communist Party—didn't you answer his question saying that you were not a member of the party?

Mr. KIMMEL. I did.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you a member of the party yesterday?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. No, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you a member of the party last year?

Mr. KIMMEL. No, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you a member 5 years ago?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you a member of it 4 years ago?

Mr. KIMMEL. I wasn't a member 4 years ago.

Mr. SCHERER. Then Mr. Moulder, of course, was correct in asking you the questions he did. It is obvious that you have left the Communist Party between 4 and 5 years ago, and he just wanted to give you the opportunity to explain the circumstances under which you left and why you left.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. COHN. Pardon me, sir. Was that a question you were addressing to him?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes; it was a question.

Mr. KIMMEL. Will you repeat the question, please.

Mr. SCHERER. I said it is obvious from the recent answers you gave to the questions I just asked you that you left the Communist Party somewhere between 4 and 5 years ago from this day, or you contend that you left the party sometime between 4 and 5 years ago. Therefore, the committee was interested in knowing why you left and under what circumstances you left the Communist Party. Will you tell us that?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I did not say that I left the Communist Party, and I invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I know you didn't say that you left it, but I said that it was obvious from your answers that you did leave between 4 and 5 years ago. You can't draw any other conclusion than that from your testimony.

My question is, if you want to tell us, what were the circumstances that caused you to leave the party? Do you want to tell us or not? You don't have to tell us. You can invoke the fifth amendment.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I don't want to say anything because I use the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kimmel, you would not answer as to whether you were a member of the Communist Party on January 1, 1951. You said you were not a member of the Communist Party on January 1, 1952. Was there any change in your employment during that period of time with Mine, Mill, and Smelter?

Mr. KIMMEL. Any change in my employment?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. KIMMEL. Where?

Mr. TAVENNER. With Mine, Mill, and Smelter.

Mr. KIMMEL. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. You held the same position straight through? There was no change?

Mr. KIMMEL. Now let me get this straight.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you became an organizer for Mine, Mill, and Smelter at what date?

Mr. KIMMEL. I can't say what date exactly.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is why I am asking you as to whether there was any change in your official relationship to Mine, Mill, and Smelter at any time during that period of 1 year to which you have not said yea or nay as far as membership in the Communist Party is concerned.

Mr. KIMMEL. I don't believe there was any change.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't think there was any change.

Let me ask you this: Were you a member of the Communist Party as late as December 1, 1951?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I decline to answer on the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now we are down to the month of December.

January 1, 1952, you were not a member. December 1, 1951, you won't say.

Now let me ask you this question: Were you advised by any of the leadership of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union that you should withdraw from the Communist Party in order that you might comply with the law requiring the filing of this non-Communist affidavit of February 27, 1952?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. So something happened in December of 1951 then, didn't it, which affects your testimony here today?

Let me ask you if the Communist Party leadership gave you any advice in December of 1951 as to what you should do as to your affiliation with the Communist Party in light of the fact that you were required by law to give this non-Communist affidavit.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I decline to answer under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. This was a very acute matter at the time or just a little before you signed this first affidavit, as to how Communist Party members were going to get around signing the affidavit which would subject them to prosecution for perjury if they were still members of the Communist Party. That was a very acute question, wasn't it?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. Did you say acute?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, acute; serious question.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. A question which provoked a great deal of argument and discussion within the Communist Party and also within the leadership of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer on the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact is you merely formally resigned from the Communist Party in order that you might sign this affidavit and not fear prosecution for perjury. You never really got out of the Communist Party, did you? You merely did it so you could freely sign

or at least feel free to sign this non-Communist affidavit as required by the Taft-Hartley law. Is that not right, Witness?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't that what happened in your case?

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't that the reason you sparred with Mr. Moulder when he asked you the question about your leaving the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. It is clear to the committee that that is what happened in your case because we know it has happened in many cases. It is obvious from the testimony that is what you did. I doubt whether you left the Communist Party actually.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kimmel, that is a matter to which this committee has given a great deal of thought and study. It was the basic consideration for this committee's sponsorship of the 1954 amendment to the Internal Security Act. It was based on the belief by this committee that this affidavit didn't mean anything if a member of the Communist Party resigned formally or organizationally speaking, you might say, from the Communist Party, and yet retained his affiliation with the Communist Party.

It is for that reason that this committee sponsored the legislation it did. And it is still considering the question.

You are in a position, if you would tell us the facts in your own case or in cases that you have knowledge of, to be of great assistance to this committee and to the Congress.

Now you made a very significant statement. You indicated to the chairman that there was some uncertainty in your own mind as to what constituted Communist Party membership.

I am going to ask you whether or not you made that statement because, beginning with February 27, 1952, or shortly before that, it was considered that you were no longer a member of the Communist Party organizationally speaking, but at the same time you were actually and in fact just as much affiliated with it as you had been before.

Isn't that the reason for your statement to the chairman?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer that.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask one question, Mr. Tavenner. I am sorry to interrupt.

During the year of 1951 did you make contributions to the Communist Party, financial contributions?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. Well, I refuse to answer that question under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. During the year of 1952 did you make financial contributions to the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. MOULDER. During the year of 1953 did you make any financial contributions to the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer—

(The witness confers with his counsel.)



Mr. MOULDER. During the year of 1954 did you make financial contributions to the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Actually the only difference in your affiliation with the Communist Party during the year 1953 and 1950 or 1951 was that you were not considered on the rolls of the Communist Party, isn't it?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. In 1951 it was formal dues, and in 1952 and 1953 donations.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is right.

Mr. MOULDER. The question was whether he was making any financial contributions to the Communist Party at the time he signed the non-Communist affidavit, which you referred to, and after he signed it.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kimmel, were you acquainted with Loyal Hammack?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hammack testified in executive session before this committee. He stated that he had himself been a member of the Communist Party, that he had withdrawn from the Communist Party and was no longer connected with it, and he gave the committee certain information that he had, and this is taken from his testimony:

Mr. Hammack testified that he gave his Communist Party dues on one occasion to you to deliver to Mr. Koch, I believe it was, who was the organizational secretary of the Communist Party. And I asked him:

Did you tell Mr. Kimmel that those were Communist Party dues?

Mr. Hammack said:

Yes, sir, I did.

Then Mr. Hammack proceeded to state:

In that conversation Mr. Kimmel told me that he had not paid his dues for some time but that he was in organization work for Mine, Mill, and Smelter I believe at Herculaneum, Mo., and that work done for the organization of Mine, Mill, and Smelter would serve in lieu of paying dues. Those were not his exact words, but his meaning.

Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not that is true, that you were relieved to some extent from the payment of dues because you worked for and performed organization work in Mine, Mill, and Smelter.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer that on the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with the next witness that Mr. Tavener desires to call, I would like to ask you to recall the witness Hershel Walker. There were a few questions I forgot to ask him.

Mr. MOULDER. Is Mr. Walker in the courtroom?

Mr. Walker, since you were excused as a witness I would like for you to be sworn again.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. WALKER. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF HERSHEL JAMES WALKER, ACCOMPANIED BY  
COUNSEL, R. L. WITHERSPOON—Recalled**

Mr. SCHERER. May I ask the witness a few questions?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Walker, I have before me a pamphlet that was distributed here in St. Louis shortly before the committee came, and it may be presently being distributed, entitled "Don't Try to Lose Us. Let's Talk Some About Civil Rights."

You were one of the three authors of this pamphlet, were you not?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. May I see it?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

(Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Will you answer the question?

Mr. WALKER. Would you ask the question over again?

Mr. SCHERER. I just asked whether or not you, Hershel Walker, Ella Mae Posey and Romey Hudson were not the authors of this pamphlet.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. That is my name there.

Mr. SCHERER. I am sorry. Did you say that is your name or you are one of the authors of the pamphlet?

Mr. WALKER. I helped on it.

Mr. SCHERER. You helped write it, and you three signed it?

Mr. WALKER. I am just speaking for myself as for the signing.

Mr. SCHERER. You know Romey Hudson and the other person who signed the pamphlet?

Mr. WALKER. Well, I say I am only speaking for myself.

Mr. SCHERER. I am asking you the question: you know Romey Hudson, do you not?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that.

Mr. SCHERER. You said you helped write it. And I want to know whether the other two persons, Romey Hudson and Ella Mae Posey, whose names appear at the end of this pamphlet along with yours, also helped write the pamphlet.

Mr. WALKER. I still refuse to answer that.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question. Since he admits he is one of the authors of the pamphlet he certainly now must answer. He can't use the fifth amendment as to who the others were.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer, and it is explained to you in giving this direction it is not in the spirit of a threat but to advise you of the dangers, that we do not accept your response to the question, and to advise you of the dangers of possibly being guilty in so refusing, of contempt of Congress.

Mr. WALKER. I decline for the same reason.

Mr. MOULDER. You still decline to answer for the reasons stated.

Mr. SCHERER. You, Romey Hudson and Ella Mae Posey are all three active members of the Communist Party at this very moment, are you not?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that—same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. And this pamphlet was distributed in Negro neighborhoods, was it not?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. Well, as far as I know, it wasn't confined to Negro neighborhoods, as far as I know.

Mr. SCHERER. I didn't ask you whether it was confined. Was it distributed in Negro neighborhoods?

Mr. WALKER. Some of them.

Mr. SCHERER. How many of these were published?

Mr. WALKER. I don't know.

Mr. SCHERER. Were they paid for by the Communist Party?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you pay for them?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer both of my questions since he has admitted being one of the authors of this publication.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed to answer.

Mr. WALKER. I decline for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. This pamphlet is designed to incite racial animosities; is it not?

Mr. WALKER. Is you telling me or do you want me to——

Mr. SCHERER. Yes; I am asking you a question.

Is this pamphlet not designed to incite racial animosities against this committee and particularly against Mr. Moulder?

Mr. WALKER. Oh, you want a "Yes" or "No" answer. Or do you want to make a statement about it?

Mr. SCHERER. I want you to say yes or no. I am asking you if it is not true that this pamphlet was designed to incite racial animosities.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WALKER. No. The pamphlet was designed to let the people know, to give them some understanding about the committee. And some additional additions as for civil rights, and which myself feel in particular, with a person on this panel that signed the Southern Manifesto, which, in my opinion, was subversive activity within itself.

Mr. SCHERER. You say it was designed to acquaint people with civil rights? And yet you attack Mr. Moulder.

Mr. WALKER. Facts about civil rights.

Mr. SCHERER. You attack Mr. Moulder and the committee, inferring that he is opposed to civil rights; do you not?

Mr. WALKER. Inferring that who is opposed to civil rights?

Mr. SCHERER. You start your pamphlet:

Congressman Moulder, a Democrat of the 11th District of Missouri, has charged the undersigned Negroes as being un-American.

Was he correct? If he did charge you with being a Communist, is he correct in that allegation?

Mr. WALKER. I refuse to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. I am sure that he didn't know any more than I did that you even existed before you took the stand. But nevertheless——

Mr. WALKER. Could I ask a question?

Mr. SCHERER. No. You are here to answer them.

Then you continue:

What is he investigating us for? We are all Negroes. We know who the real un-Americans are.

And then you talk about lynchings in Alabama and tie Mr. Moulder in with being opposed to civil rights, and an oppressor of civil rights all through this pamphlet.

I just want you to know that I saw this pamphlet when I first came to St. Louis. Yesterday I happened to be back in Washington, and I checked Mr. Moulder's voting, and do you know that he has consistently—and he has been in Congress a long time, longer than I have—voted for every civil rights bill that you Negroes back. And then you attack him like this in a pamphlet like this, and the whole committee, and leave the impression that this committee is investigating Negroes.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. And I might say that I come from an industrial district where I have a large percentage of Negroes in my district. And we are not investigating Negroes as such. We are investigating Negroes who are members of the Communist Party and who are attempting to infiltrate Negro organizations for the purpose of getting them to support Communist Party activities. And the Negroes in my congressional district gave me their award for being interested in minority groups on two different occasions. And yet you charge me as a member of this committee with being opposed to civil rights.

Do you think you helped the Negro cause by doing such a thing to Members of Congress who have supported the Negroes in their fight for civil rights?

You are not interested in Negro civil rights. You are interested in promoting disunity because you are a Communist.

Mr. MOULDER. May I intervene by saying, as to your statement, that we are not investigating Negro Communists as such, but we are investigating communism wherever it may exist, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Mr. SCHERER. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think, Mr. Chairman, it might be well pointed out that as a result of our investigations over many years we have not found that the Negro people have fallen for the Communist line.

Mr. SCHERER. I wanted to say that because I think when we were questioning one of the witnesses in executive session on Saturday, I pointed out that the Negroes as such, more than any other group, have resisted the determined efforts of the Communist conspiracy to infiltrate their organizations.



Mr. MOULDER. Our investigations and the records of the committee so show.

Mr. SCHERER. Without any question.

And prominent Negro citizens have testified to that fact.

So you are doing harm to the Negroes by such things as this. But you are doing it because you are a member of the Communist conspiracy and not interested primarily in civil rights, but in stirring up racial trouble.

Mr. MOULDER. One of the few.

Mr. SCHERER. One of the few, yes. Stirring it up because you are a Communist, stirring up racial dissention in order to promote the Communist cause. That is part and parcel of the Communist program.

I think the Negroes of this community should resent activity upon the part of men like you.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Tavenner, do you have any questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Call the next witness, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Linus Wampler.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WAMPLER. I do.

#### TESTIMONY OF LINUS E. WAMPLER, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, JOSEPH COHN

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please.

Mr. WAMPLER. Linus E. Wampler.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted for the record that the same counsel is accompanying this witness as appeared for Mr. George Kimmel.

When and where were you born, Mr. Wampler?

Mr. WAMPLER. I was born in Madison County, Mo., on July 31, 1917.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. WAMPLER. In Flat River, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a resident of Flat River?

Mr. WAMPLER. Oh, I have lived in that vicinity just about all my life, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. WAMPLER. My education is 12 years of schooling.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your employment since 1940?

Mr. WAMPLER. From 1940 up until 1946 I worked for the St. Joseph Lead Co. at River Mines, Mo., in the office. Since July 15, 1946, I have been working for the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Up until the present time?

Mr. WAMPLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what capacities have you worked for the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union?

Mr. WAMPLER. I have been an international representative, and am at the present time. I have also been a member of the executive board of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, over what period of time you were a member of the executive board?

Mr. WAMPLER. From January 1, 1954, until June 30, 1955. I believe that is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us, please, with what companies the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers have bargaining contracts in your district?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. Will you repeat the question, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, with what companies the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers has bargaining rights in your district of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers?

Mr. WAMPLER. The National Lead Co., at Frederickton, Mo.; the Valley Dolomite Corp., of Bonne Terre, Mo.; the National Lead Co., at Baxter Springs, Kans.; and the Humboldt Brick & Tile Co., at Humboldt, Kans.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Wampler, are you acquainted with a person by the name of Kenneth Eckert?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer that question on the basis of the fifth amendment. To answer a question on such an individual as that would degrade me, and, therefore, I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute.

What was that answer?

What was the question now?

Mr. TAVENNER. Whether or not the witness was acquainted with Kenneth Eckert.

And may I say to the witness, so that he may confer with his counsel if he desires, that the case of Walker versus Brown in the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the fact, if it be a fact, that to answer a question might tend to degrade one is in no sense a matter of defense to the refusal to answer.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. That is the reason I asked what his answer was.

I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question. We do not accept his answer namely, that to answer the question might degrade him.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed to answer.

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it a fact that in 1950 there was a hearing by the CIO relating to Communist Party activities on the part of Mine, Mill and Smelter Union which resulted in the expulsion of the Mine, Mill and Smelter from the CIO?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. That is what I understand.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a witness in that hearing?

Mr. WAMPLER. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Mr. Eckert was?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a copy of the testimony of Mr. Eckert before the CIO investigating committee given in January and February of 1950. I will read only a small part of his testimony:

Before outlining to you the testimony which I want to give, which I think will establish, insofar as one witness can establish anything definitely, let me say that, first of all, it is not to show that the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers followed the Communist Party line because that is not even debatable it is so obvious. They followed every twist and turn of the Communist Party line at any time. And it has had many turns: the era before Hitler signed the pact with Stalin; the era preceding June 22; and all the various twists and turns. That is a matter of record. And it is very plain to any fair-minded person who wants to compare both records, the Daily Worker and the union paper, that there is no difference whatsoever in any way at any time in the policies that have been advocated by the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers and the policies advocated by the Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party.

Mr. Eckert, in the course of his testimony, admitted his own former Communist Party membership, his official positions in the Mine, Mill and Smelter Union. He testified as to various Communist Party activities that he himself engaged in, including that of being an organizer of the Trade Union Unity League, which was notorious at one time.

He testified in the course of this hearing that he took part in bringing about the merger of the die casters with the Mine, Mill and Smelter Union for the purpose of strengthening the position of Reid Robinson in the Mine, Mill and Smelter Union as an official. That is, to strengthen his Communist support.

Now the committee, beginning May 14, 1956, heard a number of witnesses who now hold official positions in the Mine, Mill and Smelter Union. They were heard in Denver. One of them was Bernard W. Stern, an international official; Harold C. Sanderson, also an international official; Graham Dolan; Rudolph B. Cook, who worked in international headquarters; Anthony Morton; Morris Wright, who was an official with the local; Alfredo Montoya; a local official. All of those persons other than Mr. Dolan refused to answer material questions relating to communism.

Mr. Dolan freely testified as to Communist Party affiliations.

Here in district 4, I believe, of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Union you are one of the top officials of the Mine, Mill and Smelter in this area. We desire to ask you questions regarding any knowledge you may have of the part that the Communist Party plays and has played in the functioning of Mine, Mill and Smelter. Are you willing to cooperate with the committee in giving it such information as you have in this field?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I will answer any legitimate question which does not infringe upon my rights.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well, sir.

Are you acquainted with Mr. George Kimmel who preceded you to the witness stand just a short time ago?

Mr. WAMPLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are acquainted with the fact that Mr. Kimmel was an official of your union, Mine, Mill and Smelter?

Mr. WAMPLER. He was a local union president, and for a time he was an international representative.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WAMPLER. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer that question on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what the "tristate" of Missouri is.

Mr. WAMPLER. Well, the tristate area of Missouri is usually considered to be corners of the States of Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is Joplin located within that general area?

Mr. WAMPLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been stationed at Joplin?

Mr. WAMPLER. I worked for a period of time in that area.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Ralph Shaw?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer for the same reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know that Ralph Shaw was the Communist Party organizer—organizer at various dates between 1944 and 1948 of the district comprising Missouri and other areas, other States?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline for the same reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever attend a meeting of the Tristate Branch of the Communist Party at Joplin, Mo.?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer for the same reason previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not at any time after 1946 you, as an official of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union, paid money into the treasury of the Communist Party for the use of the Communist Party, whether they were denominated dues or not?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. And how much.

Mr. WAMPLER. Will you please restate the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether you, while an official of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union paid money, either as dues or otherwise, into the treasury of the Communist Party or for the benefit of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. The question is very broad, and, therefore, I invoke the fifth amendment and decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. If that is the reason, it is a broad question and possibly I can break it down a little.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I am sorry, sir. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You just won't answer regardless of whether it is broad or narrow. Is that it?

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer the question for the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. What I am getting at is this:

Was there any plan by which persons on a high level of employment in the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union were expected to pay a percentage of their salaries or any other sum of money to the Communist Party?



(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. Not to my knowledge, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party endeavor to obtain payment of money from officials of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter as contributions or as dues?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. Not to my knowledge, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time give a percentage of your salary to Ralph Shaw or any other representative of the Communist Party?

Mr. WAMPLER. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you pay dues to Ralph Shaw or any other member of the Communist Party, not on a percentage basis?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer, sir, for the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WAMPLER. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1946?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe, due to the positions that you have held in the union, it has been necessary that you sign a non-Communist affidavit in order to comply with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. WAMPLER. That is right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the first affidavit that you signed? That is, the date of it?

Mr. WAMPLER. Not offhand. I couldn't say, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The first that I have bears the date of December 16, 1953, which is marked for identification "Wampler Exhibit No. 1." Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not it is your affidavit.

(Document referred to was marked "Wampler Exhibit No. 1" for identification.)

(Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. And after you have examined it I will hand you a second affidavit to examine, which is marked "Wampler Exhibit No. 2."

(The document referred to was marked "Wampler Exhibit No. 2" for identification.)

(Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. The record should show that the witness has examined "Wampler Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2." And I believe the question was asked as to whether or not they were true and correct copies of the original affidavits which you signed.

Mr. WAMPLER. They appear to be photostatic copies.

Mr. MOULDER. Are they true and correct photostatic copies of the originals which you signed?

Mr. WAMPLER. Well, to that I couldn't say, but they appear to be, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. When does Exhibit No. 1 show that you signed the affidavit?

Mr. WAMPLER. December 16, 1953.

Mr. MOULDER. What date appears on Exhibit No. 2?

Mr. WAMPLER. October 19, 1954.

Mr. MOULDER. Now, Mr. Scherer, do you wish to proceed with the question?

Mr. SCHERER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on the day you signed Exhibit No. 1?

Mr. WAMPLER. No, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you a member of the Communist Party the day before you signed it?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. May I see the exhibits?

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you mean to tell us that you were not a member of the Communist Party on the day you first signed that first non-Communist affidavit under the Taft-Hartley law, but you refuse to say whether you were a member of the Communist Party the day before? Is that right?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact is, witness, you resigned from the Communist Party the day before so that you felt free to execute this affidavit as required by the Federal law, did you not? Isn't that a fact?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. The truth is that you merely formally severed your connection with the party but actually remained a Communist. Isn't that right?

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the documents in evidence, and ask that they be marked "Wampler Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2," respectively, for the records for committee.

Mr. MOULDER. The documents referred to by counsel will be so marked.

(The documents referred to, marked "Wampler Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2," were filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you followed a plan of the Communist Party to have persons in positions such as you occupied resign from the Communist Party, organizationally speaking, but yet maintain affiliation with the Communist Party?

Mr. WAMPLER. Not to my knowledge, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you do that?

Mr. WAMPLER. Did I do what?

Mr. SCHERER. What Mr. Tavenner asked about the Communist Party plan—resign from the organization.

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer that for the reason previously stated.

Mr. MOULDER. But retain their Communist Party activities. Is that the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. In other words, just formally resign organizationwise but otherwise—

Mr. MOULDER. Retain their contacts and participation and activities with the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is right.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. Is there a question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. WAMPLER. Excuse me. Would you repeat it, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you resign from the Communist Party just shortly prior to the date you first signed a non-Communist affidavit in order to comply technically with the law so that you could not be prosecuted for perjury, but yet maintain your affiliations with the Communist Party, though not as an actual dues-paying member?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer, sir, for the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are your duties as an international representative?

Mr. WAMPLER. My duties as an international representative are to carry out the policy and program of the international union that is laid down in convention, that is duly assembled each year in various cities throughout the United States, by the rank and file of our union who make the policy of our union and program of our union.

Also it is my duty as an international representative to negotiate with companies for wages, hours of work, and working conditions, and settle grievances if possible, and the other work of an international organizer, of organizing the unorganized.

Mr. TAVENNER. That gives you the right of access to the plants, does it not, in the settlement of grievances?

Mr. WAMPLER. Into the company offices, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. At any rate, it places you on a very close and confidential basis with employees who do have access to the plant if you are to settle their grievances?

Mr. WAMPLER. Sure. We have to meet with the companies along with the grievance representatives, sir, in order to settle differences.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not these plants which you have said are plants with which Mine, Mill and Smelter has bargaining rights are engaged in the manufacture of defense materials for the Government?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I don't know, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the chief product, if you know, of National Lead?

Mr. WAMPLER. At which plant, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. At Fredericktown, say. That is one of the plants, isn't it?

Mr. WAMPLER. Yes, that is one of the plants.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do they manufacture?

Mr. WAMPLER. They mine copper; they mine lead; they mine nickel; they mine cobalt. And let's see—

Mr. TAVENNER. Cobalt is a highly strategic material, is it not?

Mr. WAMPLER. That is what I understand.

Mr. TAVENNER. In fact, all of them are.

Mr. WAMPLER. I suppose they are.

Mr. TAVENNER. In fact, most of the cobalt that is used in the manufacture of defense materials has to be imported, does it not? Most of it comes from the Belgian Congo?

Mr. WAMPLER. Sir, I couldn't say about that.

Mr. TAVENNER. There is very little of it produced in this country. You are aware of that, aren't you?

Mr. WAMPLER. I am not too well aware of where and what metals are produced, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

You said you were acquainted with George Kimmel?

Mr. WAMPLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I failed to ask him, and possibly you can tell me:

You are aware of the fact that in 1948 Mr. Kimmel filed for the office of State auditor for the State of Missouri on the Progressive Party ticket?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. Sure, I am aware of that. It was in all the papers and publicized.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know from a contact closer to the situation than the papers, do you not?

Mr. WAMPLER. Well, sir, I know that he did run for that office.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your position in the convention in which he was nominated?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. What convention are you talking about?

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the Progressive Party.

Mr. WAMPLER. Where at, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. In Jefferson City.

Mr. WAMPLER. When?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1948.

Mr. SCHERER. Or whenever it was.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. Would you repeat the question, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. What position did you occupy in the State convention of the Progressive Party which was held in 1948?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer, sir, for the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you on the nominating committee?

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer, sir, for the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you on the credentials committee of the national convention which met in Philadelphia in July 1948?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In July 1948, were you a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time of the holding of the State convention of the Progressive Party at Jefferson City in 1948?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously given.



Mr. TAVENNER. Did you enter into discussions or conferences with members of the Communist Party regarding the selection of candidates for the Progressive Party in the State of Missouri?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party in the State of Missouri counsel and advise and direct the operations of the Progressive Party when it was formed in this State?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all I desire to ask this witness, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer, any questions?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. MOULDER. You stated that on the day you signed the non-Communist Party affidavit that you were not a member of the Communist Party. You so stated in the affidavit, and you reaffirm that by your testimony here today.

When the question was asked you as to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party on the day before you signed the affidavit you declined to answer, claiming the privilege under the fifth amendment.

Therefore, I am asking you, in order to give you the opportunity to make any explanation or clarification which you may want to make as to the differences in the type of answers that you have given to the committee——

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I do not wish to add anything to my previous answer, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. I will ask you the same question I asked another witness.

Do you believe that leaving the participation in organizational work in the Communist Party but still retaining contact and participating actively in Communistic or Communist Party affairs would justify an answer that you were not a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer, sir, for the reasons previously given.

Mr. MOULDER. The point I am trying to make and also clarify is: assuming that a person was an active member of the Communist Party on a certain date, say in 1953, and carried a card as a member of the party and actively participated in its affairs at party meetings, and paid dues and gave it his active attention, but then, the next day, would surrender his Communist Party card and send in a letter of resignation but still retained his contacts and actively participated and attended Communist Party affairs and probably continued to make contributions, would that justify him in taking the position that he was no longer a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. I decline to answer, sir, for the reasons previously given.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you continue to contribute money or time or services to the Communist Party after you signed the non-Communist Party affidavits referred to in the testimony, which you identified and which have been marked "Wampler Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2"?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you at any time confer with anyone or seek the advice of or follow the directions of any leaders, officials or members of members of the Communist Party in connection with your duties and work as an International representative of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WAMPLER. Not to my knowledge, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I recall another witness for just 1 or 2 questions?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to recall Mr. George Kimmel.

Will you come forward, please, sir?

Mr. MOULDER. Will you be sworn, please, again?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. KIMMEL. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF GEORGE KIMMEL, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, JOSEPH COHN—Recalled

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kimmel, I hand you a photostatic copy of a document entitled "Declaration of Candidate for Nomination," purportedly signed by George Kimmel. Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not that is a copy of your declaration?

(Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. It is marked for identification "Kimmel Exhibit No. 3."

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. It appears to be.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to introduce it in evidence and ask that it be marked "Kimmel Exhibit No. 3" for retention in the committee files.

I hand you now an additional document marked "Receipt for filing fee." Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not it is a photostatic copy of the original receipt which was given?

(Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer on the privilege granted me by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You admitted that you filed your declaration. Weren't you required to pay a fee of \$100?



(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you not admit that you paid the fee that you were required to pay upon filing?

Mr. KIMMEL. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence, and ask that it be marked "Kimmel Exhibit No. 4" for retention in the committee files.

Mr. MOULDER. The documents referred to by counsel as "Kimmel Exhibits Nos. 3 and 4," respectively, are so received.

(The documents referred to, marked "Kimmel Exhibits Nos. 3 and 4," were filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. SCHERER. What fee was that you are talking about?

Mr. TAVENNER. It is a fee of \$100 required to be paid upon filing his declaration for the office of State auditor of the State of Missouri on the Progressive Party ticket.

Mr. SCHERER. Maybe he didn't pay it. Maybe the Communist Party paid it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who paid your \$100 filing fee?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Did he say he did?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, he hasn't said. He won't answer.

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you this:

Wasn't it actually paid by your local of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. And isn't the real reason why you refuse to answer the fact that the Communist Party manipulated this whole thing to have you run on the Progressive ticket and to use your local union to pay the \$100 filing fee?

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't it also true that the rank-and-file members of your local knew nothing about your Communist Party associations and affiliations?

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Or to use their dues to pay for this fee?

Mr. KIMMEL. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you instrumental in having your local union pay as much as \$1,000 to the expenses of the campaign that fall for the Progressive Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KIMMEL. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they contribute any sum?

Mr. KIMMEL. Nothing that I know of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Nothing that you know of.

Have you traveled abroad?

Mr. KIMMEL. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

And the committee will stand in recess until 10 minutes after 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:40 p. m., the subcommittee was recessed, to be reconvened at 2:10 p. m., there being present at the time of the recess Representatives Moulder and Scherer.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION, FRIDAY, JUNE 8, 1956

(The subcommittee was reconvened at the expiration of the recess, at 2:25 p. m., there being present at the time of reconvening Representatives Morgan M. Moulder and Gordon H. Scherer.)

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will come to order.

Call your next witness, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. John Rutledge.

Mr. MOULDER. Dr. Rutledge, will you hold up your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I do.

#### TESTIMONY OF DR. JOHN F. RUTLEDGE

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, Doctor?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. John F. Rutledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your last name.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. R-u-t-l-e-d-g-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside, Dr. Rutledge?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Crystal City, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Rutledge, it is the practice of the committee to advise all witnesses appearing before it that they have a right to counsel, and that they have the right to confer with counsel at any time during their testimony if they so desire.

When and where were you born, Dr. Rutledge?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I was born in Illinois, November 21, 1896.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I graduated in medicine at St. Louis University in the year 1920, and numerous short postgraduate courses since, but no more formal.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are a practicing physician at this time?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a specialist in any field or is it general practice that you are engaged in?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I do general practice.

Mr. TAVENNER. How far is Crystal City from St. Louis?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. 37 or 38 miles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Rutledge, in the hearings conducted recently in Los Angeles the committee was amazed to learn the extent to which the Communist Party in that area had taken over what was known as the Independent Progressive Party of America in that State. Evidence was heard prior to the hearing that I am speaking of in Los Angeles to the effect that the Communist Party had discovered that it could not make any appreciable headway in politics under the Communist Party label, and, for that reason, the Communist Party sought means to put another ticket in the field without the Communist Party label.

The testimony at this hearing in Los Angeles demonstrated that the Communist Party had worked out a plan in that State to make of this so-called political party a mass organization of a size that this country had never heard of before.

We were in the course of hearing testimony relating to a section of the Hollywood group of the Communist Party made up entirely of musicians. The testimony showed that the members of this group of musicians, who were all Communists, were directed to change their party registration to that of the Independent Progressive Party of America. They were directed to serve that organization by getting out and circulating petitions in order to get the proper number of signers that had to be gotten under the laws of the State of California before the ticket could be put on the ballot.

A great deal of evidence was introduced which gave the committee an insight into the use that the Communist Party was making of that organization.

Now it has come to the attention of the committee in the course of this investigation that there were various political organizations here in Missouri which actually preceded the formation of the Progressive Party in Missouri. I am not certain that I have the names of all of those organizations correct, but, according to our information, there was a National Citizens Political Action Committee, there was a Progressive Citizens of America Committee, there was a Missouri Citizens for Wallace Committee, and, then, finally, the Progressive Party, organized in 1948.

Now, of course, we know that the Communist Party, in doing work in mass organization, has to utilize the services and the cooperation of many people who are not at all members of the Communist Party. It would not be a mass organization if that were not true. But what we are anxious to learn is to what extent, if any, the Communist Party did here substantially what was done in California. That is, organizing the foundation of these so-called political groups, influencing their operations, and, in some cases, possibly dictating who the candidates should be and otherwise making the organizations function.

I would like to know at the outset whether you have any knowledge of Communist Party activities and influence in the field that I have mentioned.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you willing to give the committee the benefit of such information as you have?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you what is the basis of your information. You see, I am asking you now about Communist Party activities within those groups. What is the basis of your knowledge on that subject?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. In the first place, I was a Communist myself from December 1943 to December 1948, and I was very active in the leadership of all of these organizations that you mentioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Therefore, you were, as a member of the Communist Party during that period of time, qualified to speak on the subject?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you are willing to do so?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes, sir; I am glad to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us go back at this point, and tell the committee, please, first, how you happened to become a member of the Communist Party, and the circumstances under which you became a member.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is a long story. It goes back into the 1930's. It begins with my change in attitude toward labor unions.

I had the usual opposition to labor unions that most doctors have that think labor union leaders have horns. I live in a community where, back in the 1930's and earlier in the manufacture of glass, there was—they used a lot of sand, and some workers became ill with silicosis, and died. That condition has now been corrected; it doesn't exist any more, but it did then. And some of my patients died of silicosis. And I resigned my position as company physician through disagreement with their policy in handling those cases.

And, on learning there were two other cases after I resigned—the second case coincided with a labor union organizing drive—I became very closely associated for the first time in my life with labor-union leaders, and found out that some of them weren't such bad fellows after all.

That was the first change.

And then later on I was a rather ardent New Dealer. I was interested in so-called socialized medicine, compulsory versus the voluntary health-insurance schemes, and I read a lot about different systems of practicing medicine in Europe, including a book by Dr. Henry Sigerist of Johns Hopkins on medicine in the Soviet Union, in the first chapter of which he states that it is impossible to understand the situation in the Soviet Union without understanding Marxism and knowing something about Russian history.

At that time my interest in Russia was very negligible. The fact is during the Finnish war I was rather anti-Russian. But following the German attack on Russia, and especially following our entrance into the war, I was struck by the fact that most of the prognosticators on Russian resistance were all wrong, including our Secretary of War at that time.

I believe it was General Marshall who predicted that Russia would collapse within a month.

And some leading ex-Communists and writers, such as Louis Fischer, predicted on the radio from London a week after Germany had attacked Russia that if Germany didn't defeat Russia within a month's time that Russia would collapse from internal corruption and so forth.

They were all wrong, and I wondered why.

Then my interest was purely intellectual at that time, to start with.

So things went along and I was reading everything I could find on the subject of Marxism and what was going on in Russia and socialized medicine. And in August of 1943 the Communist Party fieldman, named Ralph Field, called my office, and, after quite a chat on his experiences as a veteran in Spain and so forth, he sold me on a subscription to the Sunday Worker.

There were certain articles in the Sunday Worker which were not obtainable in the ordinary newspapers, ordinary publications, especially about the condition of the war, the situation of the war in Russia.

Ralph called on me several times after that, and one day in October of 1943 I was in St. Louis browsing around. I used to have a habit



of browsing around old bookstores. I ran into a bookstore on North Grand Avenue about a block and a half or 2 blocks south of the Communist Party hall, and I had never seen it there before. So I went in.

And there was Ralph Field and Helen Musiel, whom he introduced me to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that the same Helen Musiel who appeared as a witness here this morning? Or were you here?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I didn't hear her testimony. I saw her in the hall.

And they told me that the Communist Party had opened up this bookstore, and would have it for several months until they sold off their surplus literature.

So I browsed around and bought some books and talked to them. And I went back a couple of times in 2 or 3 months that they had the store operating, and I became more and more interested in the subject of what was going in Russia, why Russia had had this unexpected resistance, and I was rather grateful to Russia for the fact that we were allies in World War II. And I wanted to find out what the score was.

So in December of 1943 I went to the Communist Party hall. Once before that, in October—one of these times I went to the bookstore—Ralph says, "We are having a meeting tonight at the Communist Party hall. I would like to invite you to attend."

I said, "O. K. I have to leave early."

He said, "That is all right. You can stay and listen to the speech that Herbert Benjamin is going to make."

So I went up—

Mr. TAVENNER. Herbert Benjamin was a functionary of the Communist Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. He was secretary of the Communist Party in the State of Missouri at that time. That was somewhere in October of 1943.

And I went and seated myself in this hall on 1041 North Grand, and I listened to the—his speech was the first thing on the program.

And then I left—when he came in he looked at me. He had never seen me before. He walked up and down and looked at me, and Ralph Field whispered something in his ear. And then he went ahead and nothing was said.

The next time I saw him then was in December of 1943 when I went to the Communist Party hall. And I told him that I had been trying to study Marxism and communism—I was interested in Russia—on my own. But I wasn't getting anywhere, and I understood that they offered courses in communism and Marxism, and I would like to talk to him about it.

I asked him, first, how long he thought it would take me, and he told me it would take me about 5 years.

I thought that sounded like a long time.

But we talked, and he asked my background, and we talked for an hour or an hour and a half, maybe longer. And finally he says, "Well, if you are interested in joining one of our study groups, why, we will sign you up."

And he said, "There are some questions I want to ask you first. Do you believe in socialism?"



And I said that I didn't know that I believed in socialism or not. I wanted to find out.

And then he said, "Do you believe in the right of the labor unions to freely organize?"

I said that I did.

He said then, "Do you believe in the rights of labor unions to engage actively in politics?"

I said that I did.

He said then, "Are you in favor of making some peace between Russia and the United States after this war is over?"

I said, "I certainly am."

And, well, he thought that sounded pretty good. And we shook hands, and he said that—he had me subscribe to some literature, some magazines, publications, which I hadn't been taking before. One was called The Communist, and, another, Political Affairs. And another one was New Masses. And I also subscribed to the Daily Worker, and I also subscribed to Science and Society.

And he said that I would hear from him within a short time, that I would later be assigned to a study group of supposedly professionals.

About 10 days or 2 weeks later I received an engraved invitation to attend a reception for Mr. Louis Budenz out at the bookshop preceding a talk that Mr. Budenz was going to make at the Kiel Auditorium.

Of course, I went.

He also had suggested that I join the bookshop as a member, which I did that same afternoon. And I went out and paid \$10 and joined this bookshop which was probably a Communist-front organization. But many liberals and outstanding people of St. Louis had been inveigled into—or were members of it, I should say.

That is how I started my—yes. Then about the 1st of January 1944 I received a notice or a card to report to some house—I don't know the address—at this first meeting of the study group that I was supposed to attend.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was a study group of professionals?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Mostly supposed to be professionals, yes, sir; some professionals.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall who were the instructors at that group?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. There were different ones. I think that possibly Barney Strom was the instructor in the first session that I attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. S-t-r-o-m?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. S-t-r-o-m.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the first name?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Barney. They called him Barney.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a functionary of the Communist Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. He was a minor functionary I should say. He was very active in the Communist Party, and one of the organizers of the Civil Rights Congress in Missouri later on.

Other instructors were—well, they took turns about. Paul Jans acted as instructor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Paul Jans?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Paul Jans.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the last name?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. J-a-n-s.

Sarah Shaw, the wife of Ralph Shaw, acted as instructor one night. When I say instructor—they are not instructors. They led the discussion.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that they led in the instruction as well as being members of this professional group or study group?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall the names of any others who either acted in the capacity of instructor or students?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, Barney's wife was present at several times.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is Barney Strom's wife?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Barney Strom's wife.

And Joe Kozak was present.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell his last name?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. K-o-z-a-k.

Let's see. The personnel of the meetings changed from time to time. And the meetings were held very irregularly, no set system about it. In fact, after I had gone to a few of them I sort of complained that I wasn't getting what I thought I wanted out of it, and they suggested that I get a bunch of people together down in Crystal City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, first of all, do you recall whether Helen Musiel was a member of that group?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Helen Musiel was a secretary of the St. Louis Communist Party, and she was not a member of that group. She attended maybe 1 or 2 meetings to enter into the discussion.

Mr. TAVENNER. What seemed to be the principal object of that group?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, it was—rather than being a course in Marxism the object was to indoctrinate people who attended in the current Communist Party line. They would discuss—the meetings always started out with a complete discussion of current affairs, starting with the war situation, the international situation and the national situation and the local situation, and it would be a rather complete discussion, a very thorough discussion I should say. But they always were very careful to give the Communist Party viewpoint on all of those things. And different controversial subjects that might arise would be discussed early, and then at the end sometimes they would have a discussion on Marxism, and sometimes we wouldn't.

I think during those 6 or 7 times that I went that first year I don't think I ever had more than 1 real talk on dialectical materialism, which is a Hegelian philosophy of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis and so forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any underlying motive that seemed to exist there in these classes as to what practical way these teachings could be applied to the individual?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. You see this was in the year 1944, and the Communist platform then was to win the war. That was everybody's platform. And they really put themselves up in the front of the movement. It was hammering away at winning the war. Like this first meeting I attended; it was on opening up the second front. They wanted us to open up the second front in France. And then they wanted everybody to contribute everything that they could to winning the war. In fact, they should know that many Communists joined the service. Every able-bodied Communist was expected to join the Army to help win the war, which was a very worthy object.

Their next aim, which was also very worthy in my opinion, was to win the peace. They were to begin making plans on winning the peace. And they began to talk on association with Russia in some league a long time before we actually had that sort of thing.

And then when Roosevelt met with Stalin and Churchill at Teheran, that was gone into quite thoroughly and a lot of visionary products were imagined out of that meeting that everything was going to be rosy after the war was over. Just win the war. Everything was going to be rosy afterwards. The United States and Russia were——

This was during the Browder period, remember.

That was about the line.

I had no contact with the group that was infiltrating into labor unions at that time. So I couldn't tell you anything about that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, this included the period of the Communist Political Association, what you have been telling us?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes, that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion to attend any State convention of the Communist Political Association?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes, I did.

I would drop around to the hall, Communist Party hall, once in a while. And so on one of these occasions Mr. Benjamin invited me to attend as an observer at a State Communist meeting which was held in the basement of the Mark Twain Hotel here in St. Louis about July, I think it was, 1944, in which the platform and resolutions and program adopted by the national Communist Party in New York in June were formally adopted.

So I attended the meeting as an observer. I think it was on a Sunday. I am not sure. And that is the first meeting, that was the first Communist meeting I attended outside of the study groups after joining the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. When the Communist Party was reconstituted and the Communist Political Association was disbanded, did you continue with your membership in the Communist Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any State conventions of the Communist Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us about that, please.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That jumps over into the year 1945. I attended two State meetings in 1945, one in May and one in July, one before Ralph Shaw came back, and one after he came back from the Army.

The one in the spring of 1945 actually followed the same old Teheran-Browder line, but the one in July of 1945 was an entirely different sort of thing. Ralph had been in the service during the Browder era, and he had none of the Browder-getting-along-with-the-good-capitalists idea that had prevailed while he was gone. His idea was somewhat of the old revolutionary type of communism. He was more really what I would call a Communist.

I attended a reception for him when he first came back in July, and I met him at the reception. I don't think he remembered me. And then I attended a State meeting which he called to bring about this, or adopt this change from the Communist Political Association to the Communist Party again.

Do you want me to describe that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, briefly.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Ralph made a talk on his experiences in Europe, and made a sort of pep talk to the bunch; I think there was 25 or 30. And he said that he wanted to reconstitute the Communist Party in the State of Missouri and put it on a more alert, vigilant, Marxist-Leninist basis, or some such terminology. He said there had been many changes while he was gone, and he wasn't even familiar with all the personnel.

So he suggested that those of us present write down the names of people we would like to see serve on the State board of the Communist Party, and the one that headed the highest 12 written votes would be appointed to the State board of the Communist Party.

It happened that I was somewhere along 10th or 11th on that list. He came to my name, and he says, "Doc. Who's Doc anyway?"

They called me Doc. Everybody was known by their first name or some nickname.

And somebody spoke up and said, "Doc came in through a certain club"—I think they called it the Tom Paine Club—"professional study club a year and a half ago."

He said, "Doc. He's no Communist. You are supposed to be a member of the Communist Party for either 2 or 3 years before you can become a member of the State board."

The discussion went on, and I even momentarily considered leaving at that time. But I knew I was already tabbed as a Communist. And I recall I wanted to find out what this was all about. And, besides, I was somewhat attracted to Shaw's personality.

So I kept still. And so it went on. And Ralph said, "We'll put him on the far n committee."

And, if you know anything about the Communist Party, that is a committee that doesn't function. They don't have any farm committee that works.

Mr. TAVENNER. They were filing you among causes ended. Is that it?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I went to him afterward and talked to him for a while, and I asked him, or I told him I didn't know anything about farming. So he suggested that I subscribe to the Facts for Farmers and the magazine put out by the Missouri Farm Federation, which I did. That was as far as my services on the State committee were concerned.

However, Ralph put on a very active campaign in wiping out so-called Browder revisionism, getting back to the Marxist-Leninist line. And we had more frequent meetings than had ever been held before. And during the next 6 months I attended those meetings fairly regular because I wanted to find out what it was all about. And I think I attended once or twice a month for the next 6 months.

I took no part except for discussion and asking questions, and so forth, until the last meeting that I attended like that. It was early in January of 1946. There had been a strike of the gas workers in Kansas City. It lasted about 3 months. A strike that caused quite a little hardship. The Communist Party had no part in the strike. They hadn't yet given up this idea of a no-strike agreement which they held during World War II. I served merely as an observer. I gave the report of this strike to the meeting, these monthly meetings Ralph Shaw called. That is the only talk I ever made at a Commu-



nist meeting. And Ralph complimented me on the clearness of the talk, told me he wanted to see me afterward.

And, so, afterward I met with him in his office, and he said, "Doc, how did you ever happen to get started coming to the Communist Party hall?"

I told him my whole story. And he said, "You shouldn't be seen here. This talk shows you have a grasp of the situation. You will never be a Communist. You are just a liberal. You are too valuable a man, and you have a good political sense. You would be very valuable to us politically. I would rather you wouldn't come around the Communist Party hall any more."

That was agreeable with me.

But I kept on receiving notices from the office. They probably had failed to tell Helen not to send notices.

So when they had a meeting in May of 1946——

Mr. SCHERER. When you say "Helen" to whom do you refer?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I am referring to the Communist Party—for the State convention, I went.

Mr. SCHERER. Pardon me, Doctor.

You mentioned a woman's name——

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Helen Musiel. That is the same one I mentioned before. She was secretary of the St. Louis City Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were told by Shaw that you were too valuable a man to be coming to the Communist Party meetings. Is that what I understand?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. He said I shouldn't be seen at Communist Party meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Should not be seen there?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. That you were too valuable?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. He said that you will be valuable to us politically.

Mr. TAVENNER. You will be valuable politically.

By that it was meant that if it became general knowledge that you were a member of the Communist Party you would not be able to serve the Communist Party without going under the label of the Communist Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right. That is right exactly.

Mr. TAVENNER. The only way the Communist Party could make any headway in this area was just like in California; they couldn't do it under the Communist Party label.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Therefore, they had to deceive the public and to deceive other people who were going to be in the movement by concealing any possible Communist Party connection.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I never denied that I was a Communist. I never went around telling people that I was. Nobody ever asked me until the FBI came to see me. Nobody ever asked me. I just went my merry way.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

So Shaw told you to stay in the background?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. That you were too valuable a man.

Now before we go any further with that I would like to go back and ask you several questions.



You said you served on the State committee. For how long a period of time? That is the State committee of the Communist Party or the State board of the Communist Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I never functioned as a member of the State board. Just that first day was the only day I was appointed. The only time that anything relating to farming at all was ever discussed was that first day when I asked Ralph where I would get the information about farming.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your connection with the State board sufficient to be able to tell us the names of other persons who were on the State committee or State board at that time?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I think I can name a few of them.

There was Ralph himself, and then there was Bill Sentner and Al Friedman and——

Mr. TAVENNER. Al Friedman?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Al Friedman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bill Sentner?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. And Al Friedman and Paul Jans.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who is that?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Paul Jans.

Mr. TAVENNER. Paul Jans.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I named him once before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. And I think one of the Kansas City people, but I can't remember which one.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Joe Kozak was on the committee at that time?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I think he was appointed, either elected or appointed shortly after.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was James Sage on it at that or any other time?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I believe he was on the next year, in 1946. I don't believe he was there in 1945, at the 1945 meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well now. Before you found out exactly what Shaw was holding you in reserve to do, did you have any other Communist Party activities later on? Were there any special meetings that you attended with any of the leadership of the Communist Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, I attended a lot of—all kinds of meetings. But these monthly meetings that they would have at the Communist Party hall on Sundays were the only ones in which I met with Communist Party leaders.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right, then, if you will proceed to tell us how you found out, or what you found out Ralph Shaw meant when he said that you were too valuable to attend meetings and that you could be used politically or for political purposes.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, the first time that was put into action, or the idea was in effect was the day following the dinner for Wallace. They had a dinner for Wallace in late May or early June in 1946, and the next day after that dinner they then issued a call for progressives and liberals and different people who received invitations to meet and set up a Missouri chapter of the National Citizens Political Action Committee. And I was one of those invited.

I had belonged to the National Citizens Political Action Committee since its inception on a national basis, but there had been no State

chapter. And this meeting, the next day after the Wallace dinner, was to set up a steering committee to found a State chapter of the National Citizens Political Action Committee. I was invited. That was in the Jefferson Hotel.

So I went the next afternoon. And before the meeting started a man came up to me and introduced himself as Bill Steinberg. He says, "Dr. Rutledge?"

And I said, "Yes."

He said, "Ralph tells me you are to be head of this committee."

Mr. TAVENNER. Ralph?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Ralph, meaning Ralph Shaw.

I said, "Is that so?"

And he said, "Yes, that is so."

And would I serve?

I was sort of flattered. So I said, "I suppose so, if they want me."

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Ralph Shaw the head of the Communist Party in this district at that time?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. At that time, from July 1945 until some time in the summer of 1948 or early fall of 1948, he served as head of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. And it was the head of the Communist Party that said you were to act as the head of this organization?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right, sir, if you will proceed.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Shortly after that Beany Baldwin, who is a national chairman—B. C. Baldwin—they call him Beany—national chairman of the National Citizens Political Action Committee, and the manager of the group from then on clear through to the Progressive Party days, from the executive offices in New York—approached me also, and he said that he understood that I was to be chairman of the Missouri chapter of the National Citizens Political Action Committee.

And I said, "That is what Bill Steinberg told me."

And he congratulated me and so forth.

So we went ahead and had a meeting of a steering committee. There was about 20 people present. And there was no opposition. I was nominated and elected without any opposition.

We set up a committee to arrange meetings in Jefferson City, to set up the Missouri chapter of the National Citizens Political Action Committee, which was held early in July of 1946 at Jefferson City.

Do you want me to go ahead from there?

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment at that point.

You spoke of this meeting. Did you say at the Jefferson Hotel?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And then you said that there was a separate meeting of a smaller group just before that meeting, if I understood you correctly.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. No. This was the smaller group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Oh, this was the smaller group.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. In the Jefferson Hotel, set up as a sort of steering committee to arrange for a meeting in Jefferson City to set up the State chapter of the National Citizens Political Action Committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell me whether any of these functionaries of the Communist Party whose names you have already mentioned were present at this meeting?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. They were not.

Mr. TAVENNER. They were not. All right, then, if you will proceed.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, I met with various ones of the members present who were all a bunch of liberals. And we met several times and arranged our meeting in Jefferson City at which I began as chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this on a State level?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. State level. There was about 60 present, I should say. And it was kind of a hard group to handle. There was a bunch of about 10 or 12 students from Washington University present who were out to have a little fun, I guess. They started out the meeting by demanding that the platform adopt a statement of policy of organizing a group of liberals and farmers and exclude labor because labor had a CIO-PAC.

Of course, that was contrary to all that I had been taught, and really contrary to what actually I believed in.

It was quite a difficult meeting to handle. These youngsters were quite persistent in their idea that they wanted an organization of liberals and farmers in this Political Action group. And after a couple of hours I had to call a recess and ask Charlie Wilson, who was one of the liberals present, to help me out in chairing the meeting. So, following that, about every hour, we would alternate—he would preside an hour and I would preside an hour—and we finally got the thing whipped through after about 6 hours of meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the Communist Party position on that subject as to whether or not the party should be organized on the basis of farmers and liberals?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, the Communist Party position has always been that the basis of all political action is labor. And the farmers and liberals were welcomed in to fill in the gaps for front dressing and so forth, but the fundamental basis of all political action is based on organized mass labor unions. That is the fundamental thesis of the Communist Party as far as I am concerned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in conference with Communist leaders in regard to this subject?

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

Dr. RUTLEDGE. There were several of them there. During one of the intermissions I ran into Bill Massingale out in the hall, whom I had known as a Communist. And I said, "Bill, what is going on here anyway?"

Bill says, "Oh, that's just a bunch of Trotskyites trying to wreck the organization."

That is the first time I had run into contact with Trotskyites as such. I don't know whether they were or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was a term the Communists used to describe all those who disagreed with the straight Communist line, was it not?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you endeavor to carry out what you knew was the Communist Party theory and principle regarding the organization at this meeting?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I endeavored to carry out what I thought was best. And it happened in that particular time my political views were

pretty much the same as the Communist Party. For instance, if I may, I had been an ardent New Dealer in the past, and I believed in setting up or having worldwide peace. My idea was that atomic war would, for instance, create more problems than it could possibly solve. And I also knew that our economy needed a little shot in the arm once in a while, and I didn't like an idea of getting a shot in the arm from stockpiling atom bombs. I would rather have hospitals and roads and schools and so forth built. That fell pretty well along with what the Communists were after, anyway. So my actions, based on my own thinking, were pretty well along the Communist line without any too much coaching from them at that particular stage of current events.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. If you will proceed, please, with an account of Communist Party influence in these various organizations.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, let's see.

That was July 1946.

In late August or early September of 1946 they had a school for political action in Columbia, Mo., in which the Communists weren't especially active. If they were they were in the background.

Do you want the next phase?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I think the next thing worth mentioning is in the fall of 1946 it was decided on a national basis that the National Citizens Political Action Committee would dissolve and form a new national organization. And so in the fall of 1946 we began to make plans to have a new organization, and delegates were elected from the St. Louis area and Missouri to attend a conference in New York, which was done. And in December of 1946 the Progressive Citizens of America was formed.

But in the changeover we had a little conflict over finances. One, the leaders with me of the Citizens Political Action Committee decided that the money that we owed we could just forget that so the new organization would start out with a clean slate.

Well, being an officer of the old organization and with the old organization defunct, there would be no way of raising money. I felt I might be financially obligated. So I objected strenuously. So I went to Ralph Shaw about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ralph Shaw was still the head of the Communist Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Oh, yes.

I talked the situation over with him. And Bill Steinberg was around.

Mr. TAVENNER. Around where?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. He would attend some of those meetings yet. He was still in St. Louis. So he helped me, and we were able to block that move at that time.

Then in January of 1947 the Progressive Citizens of America was launched, in which I was one of the cochairman along with Charlie Wilson, who is a liberal.

Mr. TAVENNER. During this period of time—that is, during the existence of the National Political Action Committee, and on up through organization of the Progressive Citizens of America—were you in contact with Communist Party headquarters regarding its policies and its method of operation?



Dr. RUTLEDGE. Fairly well. I read most of their literature. And every time a problem would come up that I needed some help on I would talk not only to all liberals but I would also consult—I would drop by the hall and consult Ralph Shaw. I had quite a little respect for his judgment.

So I saw him, I guess, almost once a month during the period from July of 1946 until April of 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. About once a month?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I should say; yes, sir. Sometime it would be longer, maybe 2 months; but sometimes maybe twice in the same month. But it averaged maybe once a month. And occasionally Shaw told me he wanted me not to attend any more large meetings in the Communist Party, but he would let me know when there was something worth while. He would let me know certain meetings—

For instance, Krumbein was here in 1946 and I was notified. And I met him with several other people and listened to a talk on the organization of railroad unions.

And then in the fall of 1947 this same financial deal came up in connection with the changeover from the Progressive Citizens of America to Missouri Citizens for Wallace. And a certain group wanted to forget our obligations and start fresh again with a clean slate, the same people in a different organization. And I didn't have anybody to help me much in the group. So I went to Ralph about it. And it seemed to me—

Mr. TAVENNER. That is Ralph Shaw?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes; that is right.

It seemed to me that this man named Jack Becker, who is not a Communist as far as I know but who worked for the United Electrical Workers under Bill Sentner, had been executive secretary all this time. And it seemed to me that he was controlling the situation. And I wanted to see Bill about it to see if I could get Jack straightened out on this.

So Ralph said, "Well, we are having a meeting the Sunday after this." And told me that Bill would be there and if I would be there—

Mr. TAVENNER. That is Bill Sentner?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right—if I would come they would try to thresh this thing out.

So they notified me where the meeting was going to be, and I went. And we discussed the situation, and he said that if I wanted him to that he would fire Jack Becker. But I said I didn't want anybody fired; I just wanted this nonsense stopped.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would fire him from what position?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. From any position I wanted him to be fired from actually.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean from his position as—

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I don't know if that involved the union, but from his position as executive secretary with the Progressive Citizens of America which he filled until Katherine Shryver came in the fall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bill Sentner had power enough to discharge the executive secretary of which organization? The Progressive Citizens of America?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. He said we could drop him. Of course, that meant he would be dropped; that is all.



Mr. TAVENNER. If the Communist Party said he would be dropped, he would be dropped?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. In my opinion, he would have; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the control of the Communist Party over that organization that tight? That it could discharge a man who had been elected to a position?

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I don't think Jack Becker was ever elected to any position. He was assigned to us by the United Electrical Workers' organization. And whenever we needed anybody as manager or executive secretary he was always available without any election. He served, helping Shryver during the whole 1948 campaign.

I think he retained a loose status with United Electrical Workers all that time. I don't know exactly what the standing was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what extent did you receive the assistance of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers' organization in carrying out your objectives in the organization with which you were connected such as the National Political Action Committee and the Progressive Citizens of America and the Missouri Citizens for Wallace?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, I would say that they were one of the backbones of the organization, especially in the period of the Missouri Citizens for Wallace when the whole setup was being Red-baited so that the liberals were dropping out and afraid to have anything to do with it.

Organizers and prominent members of the United Electrical Workers, along with known Communists, were what carried the load for about 2 months there. Then the liberals started coming back after we got the Progressive Party set up at Jefferson City. But there was a period of about 2 months when the thing would have dropped if it had not been for the United Electrical Workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. May we have a break at this time?

Mr. MOULDER. Are you going to be much longer?

Mr. TAVENNER. Not very much longer.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand in recess for a period of 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder and Scherer.)

(The subcommittee was reconvened at the expiration of the recess, there being present Representatives Moulder and Scherer.)

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, Dr. Rutledge, what your association was with the Missouri Citizens for Wallace Committee.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I was chairman of the Missouri Citizens for Wallace Committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what extent was that committee controlled or influenced by the Communist Party in both its structural setup and in its operations?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is the period in which we had very little liberal support because of heavy Red-baiting, and the Communist Party was, more than ever, the backbone of that plus the aid of the leftwing union leaders and a few very hard-boiled liberals. That was a very

rough period, I would say. It required a lot of good, hard work and good managing in order to get the thing going.

The job was to arrange for a founding meeting of the Progressive Party at Jefferson City in early April 1948. And, as I said before, without the aid of the Communist Party and the UE—United Electrical Workers—the thing wouldn't have gone over at all. The liberals had practically all dropped away.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what extent was that organization responsible for the formation of the local chapter or organization of the Progressive Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Local chapter?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, of the State. I would say the State organization.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, this Missouri Citizens for Wallace set the meeting up in Jefferson City.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean set up the meeting for the organization of the Progressive Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right. And they met the day before the meeting at Jefferson City, met in the Governor Hotel, and various committees met—a nominating committee and platform committee and coordinating committee and steering committee and everything like that. I was general chairman, and also served on the nominating committee.

One of our hardest jobs at that time was to get people to agree to be candidates for office in the Progressive Party. And we couldn't hardly get anyone to be a candidate. And particularly we had trouble getting someone to be a candidate for governor.

One of the things that happened in that connection is one day Leonard Douglas, Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers official from the lead belt, called me up and said he had to go to St. Louis and would I care to go along with him. He said he had something interesting to talk about.

So I said yes, I would go along. I could have the day off.

So we went to Bill Sentner's house and Ralph Shaw was there. And we talked about a candidate for governor. And we were told Leonard had been trying to get a man named Wolf from Joplin to run for governor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you speak a little louder, please.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Leonard Douglas had been trying to get a man named Wolf from Joplin to run for governor. Wolf refused.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is on the Progressive Party ticket?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right.

So Ralph said, "Well, if nobody else will run we can always run Doc."

Mr. TAVENNER. We can always run Doc?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right. That is the first I had heard of that. But I didn't say anything.

Then in the meeting of the——

Mr. SCHERER. You didn't choose to run?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. The meeting at Jefferson City the day before the founding meeting—Doug MacLeod was chairman.

Mr. SCHERER. Douglas MacLeod?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Douglas MacLeod was chairman of the nominating committee.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you know Douglas MacLeod to be a Communist?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I never attended a Communist Party meeting with Douglas MacLeod. I did attend a picnic one time in the summer of 1947 at which we had met at the West End Club and gone out on a picnic in south St. Louis, in which I think everybody else there were Communists except him. But I never attended a Communist Party meeting with Douglas MacLeod.

But, anyway, Douglas MacLeod was chairman of the nominating committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say "except him" do you mean by that that he was not a member of the Communist Party or that you did not know?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I cannot say that Douglas MacLeod is a Communist. He never identified himself as such to me. He was very closely associated with the Communist Party, but so was I. Of course, I was a Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was the head of this—

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Nominating committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Nominating committee.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right.

And so the question came up as to who the candidate for governor was going to be. And Doug said, "Well, Doc Rutledge will be the candidate for governor."

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me. What did you say?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. He said, "Dr. Rutledge will be our candidate for governor." And I said that I wouldn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you discussed that with him before that meeting?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. No; I hadn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how Douglas MacLeod got the information that you were to be the candidate for governor?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. He never got it from me because I had never told anybody that. And the only one that I ever heard mention it had been Ralph Shaw. And I hadn't taken that too seriously at the time.

When Doug brought it up it sounded like it had been discussed somewhere along the line. Other members of the committee, the nominating committee, were Margaret Bush Wilson and her father, and Linus Wampler. Linus Wampler was a member of this nominating committee also. And they were all quite surprised that I wouldn't run for governor.

And I remember Mr. Bush—that is Margaret Wilson's father—wanted to know why. I told them when I ever got this thing set up I was getting out of politics and going back to practicing medicine.

He couldn't understand it. But, anyway, then they wanted to put Margaret Bush Wilson on as a candidate for governor. But, somehow, that didn't sound quite right even though she was a wonderful person, I think.

And when the nominating committee finally stopped their meeting this was still open; the candidate for governor still had not been selected.

Somewhere along about summertime I got word—I don't remember how it was—I was to go to Bill Sentner's room after supper. And Al Marcus Murphy was there, and I don't remember who was with me, whether it was Doug or—

I had better not. I don't remember who was with me. Someone was with me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is Al Marcus Murphy the same person known as Al Murphy?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes; that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was a functionary of the Communist Party, was he?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes; that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. The purpose of this meeting was to thresh out who was going to be the candidate for governor on the Progressive Party ticket. And it just didn't seem quite right that Margaret Bush Wilson would run for governor, as nice a person as she was.

But it took Al Murphy to put the quietus on it. He made the statement that "She can't be candidate for governor because she represents no mass organization. She is just an individual. And the one to be candidate for governor should be head of some labor union or with mass labor following."

So Bob Logsdon was suggested.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bob who?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Bob Logsdon, one of the UE workers, United Electrical Workers organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell his last name.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Logsdon, L-o-g-s-d-o-n.

And then we decided that we would have Margaret Bush Wilson run for Congress in one of the St. Louis districts, which she did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Logsdon is from Evansville; is he not? Is he in Evansville now?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I couldn't tell you. I don't know where he is. I haven't seen him since 1948.

Anyway, he was affiliated with the United Electrical Workers Union in St. Louis. He became the candidate for governor on the Progressive Party ticket.

Mr. TAVENNER. In connection with these activities of yours, did you meet a person by the name of Hershel Walker?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes, sir. I met him at the Communist Party hall on several occasions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he also active in the work of these various political organizations?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. He probably was in a different field than I was. He worked—I think he worked with a few labor unions. I didn't have any direct contact with him in connection with the Progressive Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You continued after that meeting to act as chairman of the founding convention of the Progressive Party in Missouri; did you not?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes. I opened the meeting the next day. I introduced Rev. Olin Whitfield, the Negro minister who gave the invocation, and then I turned the meeting over to Katherine Shryver who introduced the chairman of the day, who was a student from Missouri University—I can't remember his name—who did a very good job. He was a veteran in law school there. And then my work was done except for an advisory capacity after that.

I went to Philadelphia, of course, to the national meeting in July.



Mr. TAVENNER. Did you observe any of the activities of the Communist Party in Philadelphia?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, not directly. But the whole meeting—

There was one thing, one point came up there that was very definitely an instance of following the Communist Party line.

In the resolutions committee somebody had put in a resolution about favoring the minority groups such as freedom of Ireland. Every political party has that. The Communists put that in. And there had been a resolution introduced about establishing a Free State of Macedonia, Greater Macedonia. And this resolution had been killed in committee. And when the resolutions committee gave its report this minority group favoring this Greater Macedonia thing brought the point of order to the floor of the convention for debate.

Of course, that was at the time of the Stalin break with Tito, and what had once been—Tito had once been a hero of the Communist Party and had suddenly become a traitor at that time. This subject was considered too hot for the Progressive Party to handle.

I think that was an instance of the international Communist Party line involving a political organization in the United States. They voted overwhelmingly to turn that resolution down whereas the year before I observed it was in the majority.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee as briefly as you can persons that you came in contact with as a member of the Communist Party that you can say of your own personal knowledge were members of the Communist Party other than those you have already given.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, there is Irma and Bob Manewitz.

I don't know whether I mentioned Ray Koch or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not believe so.

What was Ray Koch's occupation? Do you know?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. His occupation you say?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. The only occupation I knew he had was fulltime functionary of the Communists. I never knew him in any other occupation. He was an outstanding organizer in 1946 and 1947 and 1948. 1947 and 1948 anyway.

And, besides those I have already mentioned, I knew Herbert and Lillian Benjamin. And, of course, I knew Ann Yasgur.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did Ann Yasgur do in the Communist Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Forrest. I don't remember his first name at the moment but when Forrest left for the service Ann Yasgur filled in until Ralph Shaw got back from the Army. Her official title was educational director of the Communist Party of Missouri. She actually acted as the secretary of the Communist Party of Missouri until Ralph came back in July of 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time that Ann Yasgur was acting in this capacity of secretary to the Communist Party of Missouri you were attending and had been assigned to a professional study group of the Communist Party, had you not?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That was in 1945. Ann Yasgur never attended the groups that I attended. She was sort of an overall director, and I never attended a study group. I attended quite a few meetings at the Communist Party hall at which she was present, in which she functioned.



Mr. TAVENNER. What I am trying to find out is what opportunity Ann Yasgur had to know that there was in existence a study group, a professional study group in the Communist Party such as the one that you attended.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Of course, the one I attended was a very inefficiently run thing, and she may not have considered that very much. But she should have known all about it. That was her——

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become aware of the existence of——

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I think——

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. May I say this man Forrest—Jim Forrest left in the fall of 1944, and Ann Yasgur became active in 1945. I never attended any professional groups in 1945—very few; occasionally. I really wasn't very active. The one I was associated with wasn't very active during the time Ann was educational director.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time was she employed in the headquarters of the Communist Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Oh, yes. But that was full time.

Mr. TAVENNER. After you stopped attending these professional groups of the Communist Party did you become aware of the existence of another professional group of the Communist Party? Say after March 1946? I am not asking you whether you were a member. I am just asking whether you were aware——

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Of another professional group?

Mr. TAVENNER. Of a professional group of the Communist Party made up of lawyers, doctors, and professional people.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I can't remember now of any group like that, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course, you were directed to stay in the background and not attend meetings, were you not?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right, that is right. I couldn't answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Marcella Oser?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she known by you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes, sir, the wife of Nathan Oser who was also a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether she was from Kansas City?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Who? Marcella Oser?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I think she was originally from Ste. Genevieve. Her maiden name was Sexauer, I understand.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did she assist in setting up the Progressive Party in Kansas City?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Oh, I think she did. At least her husband was active out there.

I ran into him when we had—we had about two meetings in Kansas City during the summer of 1948 to help get the Progressive Party started in Kansas City. And at one time I met with a small group including Nathan Oser.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Naomi Ring?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Naomi Ring was in this first professional group I attended. She was treasurer of the first professional group I attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with her husband?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Not at that time. I met her husband in Philadelphia, strange to say. Never met him before. I met him in Philadelphia in the year 1948, in July.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you say that you left the Communist Party in 1948. Will you tell the committee briefly what motivated you in making the decision to leave the Communist Party?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, there are many reasons. Just what you heard before: the distortion of history; I disagreed from a philosophical standpoint with the philosophy of Marxism, its intolerant lack of spiritual values. As a doctor I know that people need a healthy philosophy on the spiritual side which the Communist Party and Marxism don't have. And many things.

Then the action of this so-called Hollywood Ten in making propaganda speeches instead of answering questions was sort of ridiculous.

When the Communist members who were convicted on the Smith Act broke their bail I considered that as a defiance to the Government which I couldn't condone.

And from that moment on I lost all sense of loyalty to the Communist Party.

That is part of the reason.

Another reason: I had broken this—I developed during the years that I was associated with them, I should say, a sort of false sense of loyalty which I was able to overcome, which current events helped me overcome, and just my own reasoning.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by false sense of loyalty?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, I am not a philosopher or a lawyer, but I think that, in describing the reason or thinking about why people don't break away from the Communist Party—and this is one of the most important things of all—I know I felt the pull of it. People get in this thing for some reason such as maybe they are a member of a racial minority, or maybe they are a member of a leftwing labor group, or maybe they are deeply affected by events in the world. In my own case I was very deeply affected, for instance, by these gas furnaces at Dachau, Belchen, and Buchenwald. I used to feel so deeply about that that I couldn't hardly sleep at night. And in my own mind I would think "Well, Russia is doing more to destroy people who did that than anybody else." I built up a false sense of loyalty for Russia for a short period of time, which I was able to overcome eventually. But for a time I felt that loyalty.

There is a pull there that you can't quite get away from. When you develop that false sense of loyalty you begin—

Mr. MOULDER. Was that during the period of time when Russia was our ally?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. I would rather call them a cobelligerent, Mr. Chairman, than an ally.

Mr. MOULDER. At that time they were a military ally.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Other people have other things that affect them. I don't know what they are. That is something that they have to think out themselves.

You develop a false sense of loyalty that makes you overlook little things at first, and eventually you overlook bigger things. It takes sort of a jolt sometimes to bring you out of it.

Mr. MOULDER. And during the period of time when you were associated with or duped into being and participating with the Communist Party did you realize or know or believe and did the American people generally at that time recognize that the Communist Party was an international conspiracy with the objective of dominating the free world?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I think that definitely the Communist Party is an international conspiracy to dominate the free world.

Mr. MOULDER. I say, though, at the time you were duped into becoming a member of the Communist Party you did not realize or know of that conspiracy, did you? It was not then generally known, was it, when you were first admitted?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. I read the Communist Manifesto which said eventually it will spread over the world.

However, I believe in—I entered this thing not as an advocate of communism; I entered it actually to find out, and I continued with it because of my political feelings. And when I was able to get rid of this false sense of loyalty, eventually this political thing folded up. So I no longer had any connection. In that connection, I think that there is something that is going on that could hold people as loyal to the Communist Party, and that is this peace movement which the Communist Party presents as the outstanding exponent of world peace, and actually it deludes some people into thinking they are the only ones or main ones who are for world peace. And a lot of well-meaning individuals who are not guilty of anything else feel that sense of loyalty to a group that wants peace above everything else. People want peace so bad that they overlook the bad things connected with the Communist Party.

I have been able to see through that myself for quite a while because I remember at the stage preceding World War II when they were advocates of peace, and suddenly they became advocates of war when Russia was attacked.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, overnight.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Overnight; that is right.

Mr. MOULDER. The point I was making a while ago was when you were first brought into the Communist Party, at that time the Supreme Court and Government agencies had not officially declared the Communist Party as an international conspiracy.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. No, I don't think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. At a later date did any of the members of the Communist Party with whom you had been previously in contact endeavor to get you to aid the Communist cause in any way?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. On several occasions that happened, yes.

In May of 1950 Helen Musiel and Jim Sage came to my office to get me to sign the Stockholm peace petition, which I refused to do. And then in the fall of 1952 John Day and Irma Manewitz came to my office asking for money to help defend Bob Manewitz who had been awaiting Smith Act trial in jail, and raise bond.

Mr. TAVENNER. Both of those individuals were known to you to be members of the Communist Party, were they not?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. That is right.

At that time I felt pretty sorry for Irma. I had always liked Irma. I gave her \$10. That was for their own use.

And then in July 1954, they came back and wanted money for bail, and I told them I had better warn them that I had told the FBI all I knew and I would tell them all I learned after that. That was the end of that. They changed.

Mr. MOULDER. Do I understand you have informed the Federal Bureau of Investigation of all the knowledge you have obtained?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Of Communist activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the individuals that came to you for bail?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Irma Manewitz and John Day.

Mr. TAVENNER. How much money had you contributed to the Communist Party, do you believe?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, I don't know exactly. I used to give \$10 occasionally, a \$10 so-called sustainer fee. I always managed to give a little more than straight dues. I estimate that I had given in 1944, 1945, 1946 and 1947 somewhere in the neighborhood of \$200 or maybe a little more to the Communist Party. \$250 maybe.

But I gave more than that to the Progressive Party and the other political organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you asked to mortgage your home when a request was made that you put up bail money?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes, I told Bob and I told Irma Manewitz and John Day that I had no money. They said, "You can mortgage your home to raise some money. That would be a good investment."

The thought of the Smith Act defendants in New York who had jumped their bail sort of came to my mind, and it didn't look like a very good investment to me.

Mr. SCHERER. When would you get the return on that investment?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. What?

Mr. SCHERER. Did they indicate what they meant by being a good investment?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, they were very serious about it.

Mr. SCHERER. I understand. But I am at a loss to understand how they could feel it was a good investment.

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Well, I couldn't see it either.

Mr. TAVENNER. Doctor, you have entirely and completely severed all connection with the Communist Party, have you not?

Dr. RUTLEDGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think that is all I desire to ask the doctor.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Dr. Rutledge, we sincerely want to make this statement to you, that you have performed a patriotic duty of great value to your Government and the American people by answering truthfully the questions which have been propounded to you here by our counsel and by members of the committee.

It is the opinion and the hope of this committee that former Communist Party membership should not prejudice nor be held against an individual whose testimony of Communist Party activities has that character of trustworthiness which convinces one that he has completely and finally terminated his Communist Party membership, and that his testimony has been given in good faith.



We appreciate your cooperation, we respect your character and integrity, and we admire your demonstration of patriotism by testifying here before this committee.

In the opinion of this committee, you have shown great courage. You have testified truthfully and in good faith, and society should not hold former Communist Party membership against you, nor should it stigmatize you in any manner whatsoever, and we do not believe that it will.

We hope and believe your many good friends and acquaintances will join with us in our commendation and respect for you, and we sincerely wish for you and your fine, lovely family continued success and happiness.

Thank you very much, Dr. Rutledge.

DR. RUTLEDGE. I wish to thank the committee for their kind consideration and help in sort of clearing the situation. I appreciate it very much.

MR. MOULDER. We indeed thank you, sir.

Call the next witness.

MR. TAVENNER. Ella Mae Pappademos.

DR. MOULDER. Will you hold up your right hand and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MRS. PAPPADEMOS. I do.

#### TESTIMONY OF ELLA MAE PAPPADEMOS, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL R. L. WITHERSPOON

MR. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

MRS. PAPPADEMOS. Ella Pappademos.

MR. TAVENNER. It is noted that the witness is accompanied by Mr. Witherspoon who has appeared prior to this time with other witnesses.

Will you spell your name, please?

MRS. PAPPADEMOS. Which part? The full name?

MR. TAVENNER. Both.

MRS. PAPPADEMOS. E-l-l-a P-a-p-p-a-d-e-m-o-s.

MR. SCHERER. How do you pronounce it?

MR. TAVENNER. Pappademos. Is that the correct pronunciation?

MRS. PAPPADEMOS. The last name or first name?

MR. TAVENNER. What is the correct pronunciation of your last name?

MRS. PAPPADEMOS. Pappademos.

MR. TAVENNER. What was your maiden name?

MRS. PAPPADEMOS. Poscy.

MR. TAVENNER. Where were you born?

MRS. PAPPADEMOS. Osceola, Ark.

MR. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

MRS. PAPPADEMOS. At 4006 Maffitt.

MR. TAVENNER. Is that in St. Louis?

MRS. PAPPADEMOS. St. Louis, Mo.

MR. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in St. Louis?

MRS. PAPPADEMOS. About 10 years. About that. I am not sure.



Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. High-school education.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you married?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. In September of 1951.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your employment was prior to your marriage in 1951?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I was working at the Forest City Manufacturing Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long had you been working there?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. About 3 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your employment before that?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Nothing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Pappademos, I hand you a photostatic copy of an application for passport bearing date November 12, 1952. Will you look over on the second page at the signature of Mary Posey Pappademos and state whether or not it is your signature?

(Document handed to the witness and her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recognize the signature there as your signature? It is the second page.

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. What is your question, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recognize the signature appearing there as your signature?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Sir, I decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. You decline to answer?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Yes, for the reason that it might tend to incriminate you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the second page again and look at the photograph appearing there and state whether or not it is a photograph of you?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Not from this photograph it isn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. You cannot identify it from the photograph?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. No, I cannot.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you affix your photograph to an application for a passport?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me see it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document for identification purposes only marked as "Pappademos Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. MOULDER. The document will be so marked.

(The document referred to was marked "Pappademos Exhibit No. 1" and filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. The application states that you desired to travel to Greece for the purpose of visiting the family of your husband. Did you visit the family of your husband in Greece?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a matter of fact, Mrs. Pappademos, wasn't that statement to the State Department of your desire to visit the family

of your husband in Greece a mere pretext for your going abroad, and that the real reason was to attend a Conference of the Peoples for Peace held in Vienna on December 9, 1952?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why didn't you tell the State Department that you were going abroad for the purpose of attending this conference?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who defrayed your expenses in taking that trip?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party put up the money for you to attend this conference?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment in refusing to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the committee has received testimony relating to this conference that was held on December 8, 1952. It was originally conceived by the World Peace Council. In countries throughout the world a sponsoring committee was created. Dr. Willard Uphaus, cochairman of the American Peace Crusade, was an executive secretary of the United States sponsoring committee.

The committee has also discovered, Mr. Chairman, that a formal approval of this congress was adopted by the delegates to the Asian Pacific Conference which was held in Peiping in October of that same year, 1952. An examination of the Shanghai New shows that the purpose of the two conferences, that is, the peace conference in October in Peiping was identical with the Congress of the Peoples for Peace in Vienna on December 5.

The chairman of the committee may recall the testimony of Hugh Hardyman in Los Angeles last year in which he refused to testify, but at which time it was shown he made speeches from behind the Iron Curtain attacking the policy of the United States and the conduct of the Korean war, and that in both of these conferences it has been shown that many delegates from the United States took the position that the United States was engaged in bacterial warfare in Korea.

Mr. SCHERER. Pardon me, Mr. Tavenner. As I recall Mr. Hardyman's testimony also, he obtained his passport through fraud and by committing perjury the same as this witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. He said he was going to visit his brother in Australia.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. He never saw his brother. I do not believe he had a brother in Australia.

Did he not also broadcast from the Peiping radio at the time our boys were fighting in Korea while he was attending this conference, charging those boys with committing germ warfare?

Mr. TAVENNER. Exactly so. And he was broadcasting from behind the Iron Curtain the same Communist Party line that our prisoners of war have been prosecuted for doing under compulsion, from behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. SCHERER. I believe we asked in Los Angeles why this man was walking the streets of Los Angeles, because it was obvious that he had been guilty of treason. He was giving aid and comfort to the enemy in time of war.

Mr. TAVENNER. This committee, Mr. Chairman, referred the matter to the Department of Justice for prosecution.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, the fact is you did not get near Greece, did you?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I refuse to answer that question on the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. You swore at the time you made this application for a passport that you were going to visit your husband's relatives in Greece, did you not?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. And when you so swore you lied to the State Department, did you not?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. You obtained this passport from the Government of the United States by fraud, did you not?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. And with this fraudulent passport you went to a Communist peace conference, did you not, the same one that was attended by Hugh Hardyman, to whom we have just referred?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. You stated your maiden name was what?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Posey.

Mr. SCHERER. Ella Mae Posey?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. You were one of those three individuals who issued and signed this document that has been distributed in the last few weeks here in the city of St. Louis entitled "Don't Try To Lose Us. Let's Talk Some About Civil Rights," were you not?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Yes, I signed such a leaflet.

Mr. SCHERER. And you know Hershel Walker and Romey Hudson, do you not, the cosigners of this document?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Both of those two persons and you are active members of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Now you have been married since 1951. You have not used the name of Ella Mae Posey since you have been married, have you?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Will you repeat your question?

Mr. SCHERER. You have been married, I believe you said, since 1951 to a man named Pappadamos. Did you not say you were married in 1951?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Yes, I was married in 1951.

Mr. SCHERER. And you have not used your maiden name since then, have you?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. PAPPADAMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. You did not use your maiden name in 1952 when you made application for passport. You used your married name, Pappademos, did you not?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I am going to ask you why, when you issued this circular for distribution chiefly in colored neighborhoods of St. Louis, you used the name Ella Mae Posey and not your present name?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. In fact, your name is not Ella Mae, is it?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Well, Ella Mae is the only name I know, has been the only name I have known about since I was big enough to know about a name.

Mr. SCHERER. Why did you use the name Mary Posey Pappademos in your application for passport?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Then you lied to this committee right this minute when you said the only name you ever knew about was Ella Mae. The fact is you knew about the name of Mary because you used the name Mary in 1952 when you made application for passport.

Why did you lie?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, I am not going to repeat what I said to one of the other authors of this scurrilous pamphlet when he was on the stand this morning, but who helped you prepare this pamphlet?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. If you wish to talk about the contents of that pamphlet, I will talk. But I will refuse to answer under the privilege asserted me under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I am talking about the content of this pamphlet. We are talking about it now. I want to know who helped you prepare the content of this pamphlet. That is the thing I am asking you about.

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I will refuse to answer that question under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Did your husband help you prepare it?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Sir, I would not testify against my husband.

Mr. SCHERER. I am not asking you to testify against your husband. I am merely asking if he helped you prepare it.

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. That would be testifying against him.

Mr. SCHERER. The rule is to testify against him in a criminal case. This is not a criminal case.

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I still assert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. This pamphlet was issued for the purpose of creating racial animosities, was it not?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. It was not.

Mr. SCHERER. What did you prepare it for?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. I will withdraw the question if it takes that long.



You made a vicious and violent attack upon the committee. And, of course, we are used to that coming from Communists. We have had that happen to us all over the country. But you particularly made an attack upon the chairman of this subcommittee with reference to the civil rights issue insofar as it concerns Negroes.

Did you happen to check Mr. Moulder's record before you attempted to smear him like this, his voting record on civil rights, before you issued this pamphlet?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Sir, the Congress of this United States has not passed a civil rights law in the past 30 years.

Mr. SCHERER. But you know that many civil rights bills were passed by the House.

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. No. I do not know.

Mr. SCHERER. That were not passed by the Senate.

Did you know that Mr. Moulder voted for every one of them?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Will you repeat your question?

Mr. SCHERER. Did you know that Mr. Moulder voted for every civil-rights bill that was presented to the House and whenever he had an opportunity to do so in committee, he did so?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Well, sir, none of the civil-rights bills that have ever been voted on by Congress has become law.

Mr. SCHERER. That is not my question. There have some of them become law. Some of the later ones, I admit, have not. There are later ones that have passed the House that I admit have not passed the Congress. I am asking you whether you have checked the record before you ever made these statements about the chairman of this subcommittee.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that you did not care about the truth of what you said but that this pamphlet was issued for the sole purpose of making it appear that this committee was attacking Negroes? Is that not what you—

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Sir, if you would examine that pamphlet closely, you would see it is not attacking Mr. Moulder. It is merely stating that there are some activities that he could be investigating if he would.

Mr. SCHERER. You do not think that was an attack upon him?

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. That are really un-American. And I can name a few if you wish me to complete my answer.

Mr. SCHERER. All right, I think the document speaks for itself.

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Well, it has not been examined closely. If so, you would see that nobody was attacking Mr. Moulder on the grounds that he was creating racial animosity.

Mr. SCHERER. No; you were creating racial animosity.

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. Has there been an incident of racial animosity as a result of this pamphlet?

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you, are you now a leader in the West End group of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADAMOS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you refuse to answer?



Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party during any period of time that I have not specifically inquired about?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. No; I don't even understand your question. (Representative Gordon H. Scherer left the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party during any period of time that I have not specifically asked you about?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Have you asked me?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I asked you whether you were a member of the West End group. If you would like for me to be more particular, I will.

On June 18, 1951, your name was found on a notebook in the possession of James Sage. Are you acquainted with James Sage?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on June 18, 1951?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Will you fix—repeat the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on June 18, 1951?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Well, I don't remember the dates, so——

Mr. TAVENNER. What is that?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I don't remember——

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not know whether you were or not?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. No; that is not what I said. I said I don't remember that date and I were not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Yes. You asked me two questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not a member of the Communist Party in June 1951?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Well, whatever date you quoted there. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time during 1951?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Sir, if you had just gotten my birthday, you would realize I was quite young, was not old enough to participate in any political party.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you consider that you were old enough to participate in such a party?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Well, I was not old enough to vote in the last election for President.

Mr. TAVENNER. However, you were old enough to go to Europe in 1952, weren't you?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment in refusing to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you the question again, were you a member of the Communist Party at any time during 1951?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. You just asked that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have not answered it. You have evaded it.

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. No; I answered earlier no.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean to say now you were not a member of the Communist Party in 1951?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I have just given you the answer. If you would read it in the testimony I said "No."

Mr. TAVENNER. I know exactly what you said.

Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time in 1951?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Sir, the answer is "No."

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time in 1952?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. The answer is still "No."

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time in 1953?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Than answer is "No."

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time in 1954?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. The answer is "No."

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time in 1955?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. The answer is still "No."

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the West End group of the Communist Party?

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. Sir, I don't know what the West End group is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of any group of the Communist Party at this time?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PAPPADEMOS. I will refuse to answer that question under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Clara Perkins.

Mr. MOULDER. Mrs. Perkins, do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God.

Mrs. PERKINS. I do.

#### TESTIMONY OF CLARA PERKINS, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL SHEPARD R. EVANS

Mr. EVANS. Your Honor, I appear as her counsel, Shepard R. Evans of St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. PERKINS. Clara Perkins.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your last name?

Mrs. PERKINS. P-e-r-k-i-n-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. Counsel has identified himself for the record.

Mr. EVANS. Shepard R. Evans of St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside, Mrs. Perkins?

Mrs. PERKINS. In St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. What address?

Mrs. PERKINS. I would rather not give my address.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it 3715 LaSalle Street?

Mrs. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you live there in 1951?

Mrs. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your educational training has been?

Mrs. PERKINS. I received a master of arts degree in Latin and Greek from New York University, I think it was in 1931. But I wouldn't like to be held to the date. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you resided in St. Louis?

Mrs. PERKINS. Eleven years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you an official in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America in 1951?

Mrs. PERKINS. I would like to consult my attorney.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PERKINS. What was the question, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question was whether or not you were an official of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America in 1951.

Mrs. PERKINS. I decline to answer that question on the grounds I cannot be required to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed in 1951?

Mrs. PERKINS. I was working for Wagner Electric.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wagner Electric?

Mrs. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Wagner Electric organized by the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, more specifically by Local 1104?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PERKINS. At what time?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1951?

Mrs. PERKINS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that union have bargaining rights at Wagner Electric in 1951?

Mrs. PERKINS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. What union did have bargaining rights at Wagner Electric in 1951?

Mrs. PERKINS. The International Union of Electrical Workers. I think that is the name of it. It was known as the IUE.

Mr. TAVENNER. What time in 1951 did the International Union of Electrical Workers succeed to the bargaining rights, if you know? (Representative Gordon H. Scherer returned to the hearing room.)

Mrs. PERKINS. It didn't succeed to the bargaining rights in 1951.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it some prior date when the IUE succeeded to bargaining rights?

Mrs. PERKINS. The IUE had the bargaining rights at Wagner in 1951.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us, then, why it was that you signed a non-Communist affidavit on February 5, 1951, in which you said that you were a responsible officer of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Local 1104?

Mrs. PERKINS. Because it was true.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you were working at Wagner Electric at the time?

Mrs. PERKINS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you were not employed, then, on February 5, 1951, at Wagner Electric?

Mrs. PERKINS. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were. Then with what plant did Local 1104 have bargaining rights on February 5, 1951?

Mrs. PERKINS. It didn't have any.

Mr. TAVENNER. It did not have any?

Mrs. PERKINS. So far as I know.

Mr. TAVENNER. But it was working to get bargaining rights, is that it?

Mrs. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that during the period of time when you were an official of it?

Were you also an official of that local of UE on the 18th day of December 1951?

Mrs. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of two affidavits marked "Perkins Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2," respectively, for identification purposes.

I ask you whether those are the affidavits which you gave on the dates mentioned.

(The documents referred to were marked "Perkins Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2," respectively, for identification and filed for the records of the committee.)

(Documents handed to the witness and her counsel.)

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PERKINS. I decline to answer on the grounds that I cannot be required to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. The first is a non-Communist affidavit of Clara Mae Perkins, 3715 LaSalle Street, St. Louis, Mo., under date of February 5, 1951, in which the affiant says:

I am a responsible officer of the union named below.

I am not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party.

Were you a member of the Communist Party on the 5th day of February 1951?

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. By refusing to answer?

Mrs. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has received testimony here that you were one of the teachers or instructors in the Basic Training Institute of the Communist Party at approximately the year 1946.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you either verify that as being correct, or tell us whether it is wrong?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Mr. Douglas MacLeod an instructor or lecturer at that school at any time?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. It seems to me that you were shaking your head to indicate that you didn't know.

Is it a fact you don't know?



Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Douglas MacLeod?

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. This committee, at the request of numerous Representatives of Congress, undertook to investigate an organization about a year ago known as the National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, and subpoenaed to appear before the committee in Washington, numerous individuals from different areas of the United States, including, according to my recollection, Boston, Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, Allentown, Pa., and other places.

And during the course of that investigation this telegram was received from you August 2, 1955:

We protest investigation Sobell committee as violation of first amendment.

Signed Haven and Clara Mae Perkins, 3715 LaSalle Street.

It is not my intention to ask you any question regarding your husband. But you did send, you joined in the sending of that telegram, didn't you?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PERKINS. The first amendment guarantees the citizens of the United States the right to petition for redress of grievances. I think Morton Sobell has a grievance. He has just filed in Federal court in New York City for a new trial. He charges willful use of perjured testimony by the prosecution, headed by the notorious Roy Cohn.

I have a right to speak my mind on what I think is an injustice, and what I think has done great harm to the American people, to the name of America throughout the world, to justice in the United States and to our democracy.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have not challenged your right.

Mr. SCHERER. Since you mention Roy Cohn, I happen to know Roy Cohn. This member of the committee, at least, thinks he is a fine American and denies the charge that she made against Roy Cohn.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now will you answer my question, please?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer my question? You made a speech but you didn't answer my question.

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. But preserve your privilege to speak, is that it?

Mrs. PERKINS. Correct. It is guaranteed to me by the Constitution, and I support the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. But not responsive to the questions that I ask you.

Were you on August 2, 1955 a member of the Communist Party here in St. Louis?

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. This committee, in the course of its investigation, had before it the record of receipts and disbursements by the Rosenberg committee. It had the names of many people over the United States who had acted in an official capacity. It could not subpoena



everyone. It did subpoena quite a few. We were considering subpoenaing you, but distance had something to do with our not doing it.

We discovered quite an interesting pattern in the course of that testimony. We found in every city where we had made inquiry—

Mrs. PERKINS. I read the testimony.

Mr. TAVENNER. These Rosenberg committees—  
You have read it? Are you familiar with it?

Mrs. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you: That testimony demonstrated that in every city where the committee investigated, these local Rosenberg committees were organized by members of the Communist Party. As I say, we did not make an investigation here. But weren't you officially connected with the local organization of the committee here at the time this telegraph was sent on August 2, 1955?

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't the Communist Party instrumental in the organization of this committee here?

Mr. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. The testimony that was introduced showed that, with 1 or 2 exceptions, money raised from local groups and sent through to the national organization for use in the defense of the Rosenbergs was used in part to send back to the local areas to individuals who were members of the Communist Party.

I recall one, for instance, the name of Philip Koritz, whose name has been mentioned during this testimony, as having been here in St. Louis a while, or nearby.

There were others in Chicago, members of the Communist Party, to whom money was sent back from the national headquarters in New York.

Was any money sent back here?

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive any money sent back to St. Louis area from the national organization of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mrs. PERKINS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did not.

Was any money sent back here to any other individual?

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you aware that the name of the president of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case was kept secret from the public?

Mrs. PERKINS. I read about it and then I read the account of the hearings last summer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You had never heard of the name of the president before our hearing, had you?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PERKINS. I don't know whether I heard or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not know?

Mrs. PERKINS. I just don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall now who he was?

Mrs. PERKINS. No, I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was Mr. Louis Harap, whose name had not been mentioned in any connection with the activities of the organization. And if you knew who he was, you are the first person that this com-

mittee has found that knew that he was connected with the national organization.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harap was a member of the Communist Party, according to testimony. And Mr. Harap is the editor of a Communist paper or publication entitled "Jewish Life."

Our hearings clearly demonstrated that one of the principal purposes of the Communist Party in this organization was to attempt to discredit the courts of justice and Government witnesses. And this committee has procured a letter over your signature, bearing a date as late as January 12, 1956, which can be given, justly, I believe, that same interpretation.

Will you examine the letter, please, and state whether or not you issued it?

(Document handed to the witness and her counsel.)

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. When were the Rosenbergs executed, Mr. Tavenner, if you recall?

Mr. TAVENNER. It was in 1953.

Mr. SCHERER. Did not the evidence disclose that this committee has been kept alive solely for the purpose of raising funds from the gullibles so that the Communist Party will have additional funds available from this source?

Mr. TAVENNER. Our evidence disclosed, according to my recollection, that there was a convention held in Chicago in which they changed the name to the Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell in the Rosenberg Case.

Mr. SCHERER. It is the same committee? It is the same personnel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Virtually the same membership took over.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. It has been so long, Mr. Tavenner, I forgot the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was whether or not the paper I handed her was written by her.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PERKINS. I can't answer that because I can't be required to be a witness against myself.

Mr. MOULDER. What is your response to his question?

Mr. EVANS. Your Honor, I wanted to explain to the committee, she is a little hard of hearing and that you have got to talk a little louder to her to make her understand.

Mrs. PERKINS. We are both a little hard of hearing.

Mr. MOULDER. I ask you to speak as much louder as you possibly can.

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. I offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Clara Perkins Exhibit No. 3" for identification purposes only.

Mr. MOULDER. So ordered.

(The document referred to was marked "Clara Perkins Exhibit No. 3" and filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name, Mrs. Perkins, was found in a notebook of Mr. James Sage on June 18, 1951, indicating by the way in which it appeared there that you were the leader of a small group of people

intending to make a trip to a convention in Chicago on June 29 and 30 of that year, 1951, being held under the auspices of the American Peace Crusade.

Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you agreed with Mr. Sage that you would attend that conference and take certain people with you?

Mrs. PERKINS. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. No recollection of it. It is quite possible that your name appeared there without your knowledge, or without ever having conferred with you?

Mrs. PERKINS. It did. I didn't go to Chicago.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know Mr. Sage, do you not?

Mrs. PERKINS. I decline to answer that question on the grounds I can't be required to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. You decline to answer?

Mr. MOULDER. We cannot hear you.

Mrs. PERKINS. I didn't go to Chicago.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the meeting to be held in Chicago?

Mrs. PERKINS. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you asked to go?

Mrs. PERKINS. Not that I remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall that Mr. Sage went?

Mrs. PERKINS. I wouldn't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on June 18, 1951?

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the committee's information, you were a candidate for Congress from the Third District in 1952. Is that correct?

Mrs. PERKINS. Is that a crime?

Mr. TAVENNER. Not at all, not at all.

Mrs. PERKINS. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. What part did the Communist Party play, if any, in bringing about your candidacy?

Mrs. PERKINS. None, to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you aware that in 1952 the Communist Party was active in sponsoring and promotion of the interests of the Progressive Party in St. Louis?

Mrs. PERKINS. To my knowledge, no.

Mr. TAVENNER. No?

Mrs. PERKINS. I heard such accusations in the newspapers, but I make up my own mind as to what I think I should do and I do what I think is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party when you ran for Congress in 1952?

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. PERKINS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Haven Perkins.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. PERKINS. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF HAVEN PERKINS, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL,  
SHEPARD R. EVANS**

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. PERKINS. Haven Perkins.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that counsel who appeared with the preceding witness also is appearing with the present witness.

When and where were you born, Mr. Perkins?

Mr. PERKINS. October 28, 1902, in Champaign, Ill.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. PERKINS. St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a resident of St. Louis?

Mr. PERKINS. About 11 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your educational training has been, your formal educational training?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. PERKINS. I got a B. A. from Williams College in Massachusetts.

Mr. TAVENNER. What year?

Mr. PERKINS. 1923.

I got a B. A. from Oxford University in 1926.

I was a student at Chicago University for 2 years; I think it was 1938 to 1940.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are you now employed?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. PERKINS. This question seems a very simple one and it would seem logical to answer it.

But I have been attending the hearings. I have observed that in a number of cases questions of employment have led to other questions which might be incriminating.

I am going to refuse to answer the question.

And my reasons—I have more than one reason:

First of all, Congress has made membership in the Communist Party and Communist-infiltrated organizations a crime, and, therefore, this question should be taken up in court.

And this committee is trespassing on the territory of the courts.

Article 3 of the Constitution says that the judicial power of the courts extends to all cases arising under the laws of the United States.

This committee is breaching article 3 of the Constitution.

I refuse to answer also on other reasons.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me say, as far as you have gone, the courts have held otherwise.

That question you have raised has been raised dozens of times before this committee.

Mr. PERKINS. I beg to differ with you, Congressman, sir. I beg to differ with you.

May I ask you, Congressman Scherer, how they could have held this dozens of times in a law passed in 1954. How could that have happened dozens of times? Would you tell me that?



Mr. SCHERER. You are here to answer questions. I note you are starting right off by not answering them, but by making a speech and invoking the fifth amendment.

You said it was a simple question as to where you are employed. You could give us a simple answer, but you have not. And when I ask you a question you take the fifth amendment right away. You just did. You said you didn't have to answer it.

Mr. PERKINS. I have another reason. The first amendment to the Constitution says that Congress shall make no law abridging the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition for redress of grievances.

The members of the St. Louis Committee for Morton Sobell have a right to assemble and petition about Morton Sobell.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for regular order. He is making a speech.

If he wants to invoke the fifth amendment he can invoke the fifth amendment, but not make a speech.

Mr. MOULDER. We are very tolerant and very reasonable in permitting the witness to state the reasons why he chooses to decline to answer a question by claiming the privileges under the Constitution. But we, of course, cannot tolerate a witness' explanation of reasons why he thinks this committee shouldn't exist, reasons why he thinks it doesn't function properly, and many others of his reasons which are based upon his prejudices and hope of screening his excuses for not testifying.

Therefore, please make your answer responsive to the questions by either claiming the privilege under the Constitution or answering the question.

Mr. PERKINS. I refuse to answer because the committee is breaching article 3 of the Constitution, because it is breaching the first amendment to the Constitution which says that people have a right to assemble and petition for redress of grievances, and I also assert my privilege—

Mr. MOULDER. May I interrupt you again to say that you are making statements alleging the reasons you will not answer any questions that might be propounded to you by counsel or by the committee.

Now one simple question has been asked you, and that is where are you employed.

Mr. PERKINS. My answer is addressed to this particular question.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question. And, if he doesn't answer, let's proceed to the next question.

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer.

And may I, as we have advised other witnesses, advise you to so answer not in the spirit of a threat but for the purpose of informing you and advising you we do not accept your response to the question, and that you are being advised of the possible danger of being placed in a position of contempt of Congress.

Therefore, once again, we ask you to answer the question.

Mr. PERKINS. I repeat the three reasons why I refuse to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have no other legal basis for refusing to answer?

Mr. PERKINS. You think three isn't enough, Mr. Tavenner? Three parts of the Constitution?

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, you have been told that you are here to answer questions and not ask questions of counsel or members of this committee.

You haven't answered any questions. You have refused to answer on the basis of Constitutional privileges.

Let it be understood that I am warning you that you are here to answer questions, not to lecture either the committee or counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER, proceed with the next question.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask another question in regard to this witness' refusal to answer?

Do you rely on the fifth amendment as a basis for your refusal to answer? I want the record clear about it.

Mr. PERKINS. That is part of my basis for refusing to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do rely on the fifth amendment?

Mr. PERKINS. I clearly mentioned that, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't hear you. That is the reason I wanted to make certain.

Mr. PERKINS. I beg your pardon. I thought I made it clear.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been employed by the Wagner Electric Co. at any time in the past 5 years?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Let the record show that the witness consulted with counsel 1 minute and 45 seconds before answering the question.

Mr. PERKINS. I will assert the same three reasons for refusing to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that include the fifth amendment?

Mr. PERKINS. That includes the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you held any position or office with the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Tavenner, when do I get a chance to cross-examine Cortor and Younglove?

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I ask that he be directed to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer.

Mr. PERKINS. Why can't I cross-examine them?

Mr. MOULDER. If you can find them you are at liberty to cross-examine them.

You are directed to answer the question.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. You understand the committee doesn't accept your response to the question, and you are now directed to answer.

Mr. PERKINS. I give the same three reasons for refusing to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me ask, did Cortor or Younglove testify to anything that was untrue? Did they lie to this committee, particularly when they testified about your Communist membership?

Mr. PERKINS. Is it not very likely, Congressman Scherer, that Cortor and Younglove are witnesses who are committing perjury? And how can this be brought out without cross-examination?

Mr. SCHERER. Let me ask you, if you say to this committee at this moment that Younglove and Cortor lied about you, then I will ask that your testimony and that of Younglove and Cortor be referred to the grand jury or the Department of Justice and they can determine.

Mr. PERKINS. But why not here and now? Why not cross-examine here and now?

Mr. MOULDER. But you have an opportunity now to affirm or to deny or explain any falsehood or untruthful statement that was made by either of those witnesses.

Mr. PERKINS. I want the right to cross-examine, Congressman Moulder. Are you denying me that right?

Mr. MOULDER. Why do you not now deny or affirm or explain anything about which you now complain?

Mr. PERKINS. Is it not the common procedure of the police informer like Cortor or Younglove to get to stay on the payroll by fabricating and inventing new information and bringing in new names——

Mr. SCHERER. Let me ask you again:

You have charged these men with being informers. I am asking you, was anything that Younglove or Cortor said about you untrue?

Mr. PERKINS. How can anything be brought out, Congressman Scherer, without——

Mr. SCHERER. I am not asking you that question.

Mr. PERKINS. Without cross-examination?

Why do you deny cross-examination?

Why didn't you allow Elizabeth Bentley to be cross-examined?

Then, later, when she was put on the witness stand, she had to admit that the things she was telling this committee were not true——

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, you are placing yourself in contempt. And I am telling you you ought to answer the question. You haven't answered the question.

I ask you to direct the witness to answer the question, Mr. Chairman: Whether anything that either of these two witnesses whom he called informers said, anything at all about him, that is untrue.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. You are so directed to answer the question. You have charged them indirectly with perjury. And we would like to have that information and know as to what part of their testimony, particularly as stated by Mr. Scherer with reference to you, was false and untrue.

Mr. PERKINS. I will decline to answer for the same three reasons.

Mr. SCHERER. Sure; you will decline.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. PERKINS. I decline to answer for the same three reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PERKINS. I decline to answer for the same three reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. That is all.

Call your next witness, please, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Julius Hecht.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HECHT. I do.

# TESTIMONY OF JULIUS HECHT, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, IRL B. BARIS

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, sir.

Mr. HECHT. Julius Hecht.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify himself for the record.

Mr. BARIS. My name is Irl B. Baris, attorney at law, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Hecht?

Mr. HECHT. St. Louis, February 25, 1915.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. HECHT. 1600 Faris Avenue.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your employment?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HECHT. Well, I don't rightly know.

As of last Friday I was employed at Bailey Technical School. But I was given to understand that as the result of this committee hearing that I could be discharged. So I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the nature of your employment at the Bailey Technical School?

Mr. HECHT. I am the assistant chief instructor. I teach physics and mathematics.

Mr. TAVENNER. In June 1951, your name was found on a notebook of James Sage under circumstances indicating that you were one of a group proposing to attend a convention in Chicago to be held on June 29 and 30 sponsored by the American Peace Crusade.

Can you enlighten us on the reason for your name being in that book?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HECHT. I refuse to answer this question on the grounds of the fifth amendment, that it might incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You seem very amused.

Mr. HECHT. No; I am not really.

Mr. TAVENNER. This is really not an amusing matter at all.

Mr. HECHT. I didn't think it was amusing at all. Quite the contrary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on June 18, 1951?

Mr. HECHT. I will refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know anything of any activity of the Communist Party in St. Louis in assisting in organizing a pilgrimage to Chicago to attend the convention that I mentioned?

Mr. HECHT. I refuse to answer that also, same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Mr. Sage known to you as a member of the Communist Party? That is, Mr. James Sage.

Mr. HECHT. I refuse to answer, same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been aware at any time since 1951 of the existence of an organized group of the Communist Party in St. Louis made up of members of the professions?

Mr. HECHT. I refuse to answer that, same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. By professions I am referring to teachers, doctors, lawyers.

Mr. HECHT. I have an idea of what a profession is.



Mr. TAVENNER. You have an idea.

Were you a member of any such group?

Mr. HECHT. I refuse to answer that question, same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has received testimony here that Mr. Cortor was introduced to you by your wife Thelma Hecht, and was told that you were a member of another group of the Communist Party.

The group to which Mr. Cortor belonged was the West Side group.

Will you tell the committee, please, of what group of the Communist Party were you a member?

Mr. HECHT. I refuse to answer that question, the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Mr. Cortor telling this committee anything that was untrue when he said you were introduced to him as a member of some other group of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. I refuse to answer that question also, same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. I refuse to answer that question also, same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any information that you are willing to give this committee regarding communism among professional people in this area?

Mr. HECHT. I refuse to answer that question also for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

You are excused as a witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I have a few minutes' recess?

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand in recess for a period of 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder and Scherer.)

¶ (The subcommittee was reconvened at the expiration of the recess, there being present at the time of reconvening Representatives Moulder and Scherer.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sol Derman, please.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. DERMAN. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF SOL DERMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, SIDNEY M. GLAZER

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name?

Mr. DERMAN. Sol Derman, D-e-r-m-a-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify himself for the record.

Mr. GLAZER. Sidney M. Glazer, of St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Derman?

Mr. DERMAN. I was born in Poland in 1911.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to this country?

Mr. DERMAN. When I was about 9½ or 10 years old, around 1922.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. DERMAN. Yes. I have derivative papers through my father, and that is how I am a citizen.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your father's name?

Mr. DERMAN. My father's name was Isaac Derman.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where was he naturalized?

Mr. DERMAN. Well, I guess he was naturalized somewhere in New York City. The papers that I got on my citizenship state "Southern District of New York." When I was about 18 or 16 I received the derivative papers. But I guess he was a citizen before I got the derivative.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is right.

So you were about 18 years of age when you became a citizen by derivative citizenship?

Mr. DERMAN. 16 or 18; that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside, Mr. Derman?

Mr. DERMAN. 4759 Washington Boulevard, St. Louis, zone 8.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. DERMAN. I attended elementary school and high school in New York City, and also the College of the City of New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to St. Louis?

Mr. DERMAN. About 10 years ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation or profession?

Mr. DERMAN. Well, I consider myself somewhat of a salesman. I am not too successful at it. Right now I am working for a clothing store, trying to get more accounts for the store.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Dr. John F. Rutledge? (The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DERMAN. I refuse to answer that question on the basis of the fifth amendment, which states that no one is required, compelled to be a witness against himself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a meeting in January 1948—or at any time in 1948, because I may not have the month exactly correct—attended by Ralph Shaw, Douglas MacLeod, Dr. Rutledge, and others regarding the activities of Katherine Shryver in the Progressive Party?

Mr. DERMAN. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time during the year 1948?

Mr. DERMAN. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds. (The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of an organization formed here in St. Louis after the Smith Act defendants had been indicted, entitled "The St. Louis Defense Committee"?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DERMAN. I refuse to answer that question on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. What connection have you had with the Daily Worker since 1953?

Mr. DERMAN. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Testimony has been received that funds were being raised in the area of St. Louis by this defense committee organized for the defense of the Smith Act defendants, the funds to be

used for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the trial and for propaganda purposes.

Will you tell the committee, please, what you know about the propaganda activities of this group and the use of funds for that purpose?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DERMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I will have to decline on the same grounds as before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you prepare any material to be used for propaganda by the Smith Act defendants?

Mr. DERMAN. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you prepare any propaganda to be used by the Communist Party in defense of the Smith Act defendants?

Mr. DERMAN. I believe the same question. It is the same question.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir, it is a different question.

Mr. DERMAN. I refuse to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the representative of the Daily Worker at the Smith Act trials?

Mr. DERMAN. I refuse to answer that on the same grounds and the additional grounds of invasion of the first amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1953 were you the executive secretary of the Progressive Party in St. Louis?

Mr. DERMAN. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I said in St. Louis. I meant for the State of Missouri.

Would that change your answer?

Mr. DERMAN. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DERMAN. I refuse to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time that I have not specifically inquired about?

Mr. DERMAN. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. No further questions.

You are excused as a witness.

Call the next witness, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Douglas MacLeod.

Mr. MOULDER. Please be sworn, Mr. MacLeod.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MACLEOD. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF DOUGLAS MacLEOD, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, CLIFFORD A. FALZONE

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, sir.

Mr. MACLEOD. My name is Douglas MacLeod.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify himself for the record.

Mr. FALZONE. Clifford A. Falzone of the St. Louis County bar.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. MacLeod?

Mr. MACLEOD. July 4, 1908, Kaolin, Russell County, Ala.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. MACLEOD. I reside in University City, 7446 Melrose Avenue, Missouri.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Missouri?

Mr. MACLEOD. I have lived in Missouri since 1945, late October, when I was discharged from the United States Army Air Force.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you serve in the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. MACLEOD. Just under 4 years, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to your service in the Armed Forces where did you live?

Mr. MACLEOD. I lived in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you live in New York City?

Mr. MACLEOD. Continuously for a period of about 5½ years, I believe, prior to my induction into the Army.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would take you back approximately to 1936?

Mr. MACLEOD. I believe that is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What service did you have in the United States Army? What branch of the service?

Mr. MACLEOD. I was in the Air Corps.

Mr. TAVENNER. Stationed in this country or in foreign countries?

Mr. MACLEOD. 23 months in the European Theater of Operations; the rest of the time domestic.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you acquire the rank of an officer?

Mr. MACLEOD. The lowest rank of noncommissioned officer—corporal.

Mr. TAVENNER. First let me ask you what is your profession.

Mr. MACLEOD. I am an attorney, a lawyer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Practicing in St. Louis?

Mr. MACLEOD. Practicing here in St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you practiced law in St. Louis?

Mr. MACLEOD. Since 1948. I was admitted to the bar in Missouri in 1947, but I have been practicing law here since 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. MACLEOD. Public schools in Alabama, in a number of communities, through the high-school level; University of Alabama—academic and law.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you complete your law at the University of Alabama?

Mr. MACLEOD. 1934.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed in New York City?

Mr. MACLEOD. In New York City I was employed in a number of different capacities, Mr. Tavenner. The first employment, I believe, was as a clerk in a lawyer's office.

From 1936 on—You are referring to that particular period?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. MACLEOD. I was employed as a clerk in a lawyer's office for a very brief period, and I was employed as an editor of textbooks called Corpus Juris Secundum, published by the American Law Book Co.



I subsequently was employed as an attorney in a law office on a salary, and subsequently in the liquor department of R. H. Macy & Co., and thereafter—

I may overlook some of these because during the depression I had a number of very brief jobs that lasted only a short while.

The next employment that I had that I can recall specifically: I was employed as a teacher on the WPA in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. During what period of time were you so employed?

Mr. MACLEOD. That was about 1938 or 1939. I am not sure when that employment began. And it ended either in 1940 or 1941. I believe 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you familiar with the unemployed councils in New York City at that time?

Mr. MACLEOD. I don't have any independent recollection of any unemployed councils.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Workers Alliance?

Mr. MACLEOD. I know that there was such an organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of it?

Mr. MACLEOD. I am strongly tempted to answer that question positively, but I would be a little afraid to, Mr. Tavenner. I am afraid I would have to raise some legal objections at that point simply in order to be certain to protect my interests.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are uncertain about it. That is really the substance of what you are saying here?

Mr. MACLEOD. Yes; I might say that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your employment between 1934 and 1936?

Mr. MACLEOD. I was employed for a brief period as a relief investigator in Tuscaloosa County, Ala., and I was employed for a brief period as an abstractor of titles in an oil boom community in Texas—Crockett, Tex.; and similarly sporadically employed in Texas in the Rio Grande Valley for a very brief period, also in connection with oil work. And I was employed for a brief period as a copy reader for the Chicago Herald and Examiner at the end of 1934. And I went to work for a manufacturing establishment called O. D. Jennings & Co. in Chicago, Ill., in, I believe it was, January or February of 1935.

I returned to Alabama and practiced law in 1935 and 1936 until I departed for New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. MacLeod, is there an organization in St. Louis at this time known as the National Lawyers Guild?

Mr. MACLEOD. In St. Louis there is no such organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any chapter of that organization in the State of Missouri as far as you know?

Mr. MACLEOD. Not to my knowledge. As a matter of fact, I think I can say positively that there is not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has there been a chapter of the National Lawyers Guild at any recent time in St. Louis?

Mr. MACLEOD. I have heard of such a chapter, but I am not personally acquainted with it. Only—

I am not, or any of its functions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. MacLeod, are you aware of the existence of an organized group of the Communist Party at this time in St. Louis composed chiefly of members of the professions?

Mr. MACLEOD. As to that question, Mr. Counsel, I will have to invoke some objections and some of the legal reasons why I object. And, in order to clarify my objections, I think it would serve to clarify the record and to save the time of the committee if the chairman would care to state a little more specifically than hitherto has been done the legislative purpose which underlies this present inquiry and, in particular, my testimony in relation to it.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer it.

Mr. MACLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I am simply planning to raise some objections to the question on the basis of pertinence. And, in order to know just what the area of pertinence is, I think I should know what the legislative purpose is.

Mr. SCHERER. You are a member of the bar, and this is not the forum in which you can raise any objections to the question. Nor can you ask the committee any questions. If eventually the matter gets to court that is the place where you can raise objections as to the jurisdiction of the committee or the purpose and the law and so forth.

Mr. MACLEOD. Very well, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. You can either answer the question or refuse to answer, invoking your constitutional privilege.

Mr. MACLEOD. At this time I wish to entertain the following objections to the committee.

First—

Mr. SCHERER. May I point out respectfully that you have no right to object to any question. You have a right either to answer or to refuse to answer.

If you think that the questions asked are improper or beyond the jurisdiction of the committee you as a lawyer know that you can raise that in a court if this matter eventually gets to court.

Mr. MACLEOD. I was simply attempting to draw what I think is an important legal distinction in connection with any record which any court may subsequently be required to pass upon.

There is a distinction between objections to the question and reasons for not answering it, and I would like to keep those matters separate.

However, I will confuse them if it is necessary, if I have to do it.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. MACLEOD. All right, Mr. Chairman, I will have to decline to answer the question, the reason being that it is not pertinent to any proper legislative function of this committee—one.

Second, that the question is beyond the scope of the Constitution—the congressional Resolution 601, under which this committee is empowered to act;

Third, that the inquiry is beyond the power of Congress in that it invades an area which Congress is forbidden by the Constitution to legislate in. I refer to article 3, section 3 of the Constitution, which concerns itself with the offense of treason.

I insist that this committee is going into the area of treason, and that, under the Constitution, Congress is forbidden from doing anything about that area.

Further, that the question does not require an answer because it violates the first amendment to the Constitution, both in the respect that if it has to do with legislation such legislation would be violative of the first amendment, and, secondly, in that it violates my individual right under the first amendment to remain silent as well as a corollary to the right to speak.

Also, as an additional reason, to which I attach no special legal significance other than the significance normally to be accorded the exercise of that right, the fifth amendment in that I apprehend that the answer which I might give to that question or any answer that I might give to that question might conceivably be a link in a chain which would result in some type of prosecution involving me.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I interrupt you there.

You say you give no significance to the fifth amendment which you asserted as a legal grounds for your refusal to answer. I am not certain I understand what you mean.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean you are just saying it without relying on it?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MACLEOD. I didn't mean to convey that impression, Mr. Tavenner.

I think you misunderstood me.

I in no way take away from the fifth amendment as a part of the fundamental law. I am proud of the fact that we have it.

I think that some of the emphasis that has been made in regard to the fifth amendment has a tendency to lower the prestige of that amendment. I certainly wouldn't want to be a party to anything of that character.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you rely on it? That is the point I make.

Mr. MACLEOD. I rely on it, but I do not rely on it to any greater extent than I rely on each of the other constitutional grounds which I have specified.

And, in particular, I want to emphasize the first which I specified.

Mr. SCHERER. Regular order.

He has answered. He has relied on the fifth amendment, I think, sufficiently and properly.

Mr. MACLEOD. You mean, Mr. Scherer, you recognize only the fifth amendment?

Mr. SCHERER. Only the fifth amendment.

Mr. MACLEOD. But I recognize the entire Constitution, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Regular order.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed with the next question, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. MacLeod, it has been our understanding from testimony that we have from time to time received that one of the functions of the professional group of the Communist Party is to assist other groups and sections of the Communist Party in the various problems with which they are confronted. For instance, we have heard, particularly in Albany, N. Y., that at that place the particular function of the professional cell of the Communist Party was to go out into the railroad shops and assist in the organizing of a railroad section of the Communist Party.

We are anxious to know just what function or functions the professional cell of the Communist Party in St. Louis performed.

Do you have any knowledge on the subject?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MACLEOD. I will decline to answer that question for all of the reasons previously stated, and, in addition, I would like to add two other reasons since the question particularly concerns itself with professional activities and the fact that my profession is that of a lawyer.

In that this question invades the judiciary, it is an attempt by the legislative branch to undertake to police the bar, which is a judicial function, the bar being a branch of the court.

As far as the Federal Government is concerned, it is a violation of the separation of powers.

As far as the State of Missouri is concerned, it is a violation of the 10th amendment of the Constitution of the United States in that it is a wholly unwarranted attempt on the part of the committee to go into matters relating to the legal professions, which are the proper concern of the courts of Missouri.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you, as a member of the professional group of the Communist Party, assist other Communist Party groups in any services of any type?

Mr. MACLEOD. I will decline to answer that for all of the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you, as a member of the professional group of the Communist Party, serve the Communist Party as a teacher on any occasion?

Mr. MACLEOD. Now, Mr. Tavenner, of course, you realize that that is a loaded question. It carries a number of assumptions. I don't think in that form that I should even be required to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will very gladly change the question so that it will meet your objection.

Did you teach or instruct in any Communist Party group?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MACLEOD. There again, Mr. Tavenner, it is with extreme reluctance that I feel required to invoke my rights in connection with this question.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you invoke those rights?

Mr. MACLEOD. I do as is perfectly clear from my answer, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Does that include a refusal to answer on the basis that if you did answer you feel that in good faith to do so might tend to, in some way, incriminate you?

Mr. MACLEOD. I believe the Supreme Court has said, Mr. Scherer, that it is sufficient if injurious disclosure could result. I prefer that language, their language.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer my question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

Mr. MACLEOD. I believe the question is answered, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCHERER. I think we should say, as we are required to do by a decision of the Supreme Court, that we do not accept your answer, and we do not feel that it is an answer to the question.



Mr. MACLEOD. I asserted as clearly as I could, Mr. Scherer, all of the constitutional grounds I had previously asserted.

Mr. SCHERER. And when it is not clear the Court enjoins us to ask you specifically whether or not you in good faith feel that to answer the question propounded might tend to lead to a criminal prosecution. We are directed by the Court to do that, and I am complying with that decision of the Court.

Mr. MACLEOD. I think that——

Mr. SCHERER. And you must either answer "Yes" or "No" to that question.

Mr. MACLEOD. I will answer that I think it might be a link in a chain which might result in criminal prosecution.

Many such prosecutions have resulted in this particular period that we live in.

Mr. SCHERER. You have properly answered my question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Thomas Younglove?

Mr. MACLEOD. I certainly would have to decline to answer that question on all of the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. Again I don't want to quibble, but I think for your own protection you must say that you do decline for the reasons stated.

Mr. MACLEOD. I do decline.

Mr. SCHERER. That is right.

Mr. MACLEOD. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Younglove testified before this committee that was a school conducted by the Communist Party in 1945 or the early part of 1946. He named the instructors in the group, and named some of those who attended the group as students. All of the instructors, he said, were members of the Communist Party, and only members of the Communist Party were permitted to attend the school. He described you as one of the teachers at that school.

Was his testimony true or false insofar as it related to you?

Mr. MACLEOD. Well, again, Mr. Tavenner, I can't allow myself to be provoked by my feelings into making an injudicious answer which might lead to institution of proceedings against me. So I particularly invoke the fifth amendment in respect to that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Younglove further testified that while attending the party school, from October 1945, to February 1946, at 2851 Gravois, Douglas MacLeod was an instructor at the school and stated in the course of a lecture that socialism would never come about by the use of the ballot box. We would have to use violent force and action.

Did you make any such statement as that in the course of your lecture, or did you say that in substance to the group?

Mr. MACLEOD. Well, I would like to ask you, Mr. Tavenner, if you think it is conceivable that I could have said something like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. I haven't known you as long as Mr. Younglove has.

Mr. MOULDER. That is not responsive to the question.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. You have an opportunity now to deny it.

Mr. MACLEOD. A trap, Mr. Scherer, a trap.

I assert all of the constitutional grounds I have previously asserted.

Mr. SCHERER. That would lead me to believe then that Younglove was telling the truth.

Mr. MACLEOD. It might lead you to believe anything you like, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mr. Joseph John Schoemehl?

Mr. MACLEOD. I believe he was one of the friendly witnesses, was he not, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. He was a witness before this committee.

Mr. MACLEOD. Who named names and told about people.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think he told us honestly what he could recall about the activities he observed while a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MACLEOD. I might draw a different inference, but I would have to, in view of the fact that he is one of your informers, specifically reassert each constitutional ground previously asserted.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know Joseph Schoemehl?

Mr. MACLEOD. I will reassert all of the grounds previously asserted.

Mr. SCHERER. You attempt to stigmatize him by calling him an informer. He was and is a loyal American who did a good job for his Government.

Mr. MACLEOD. That is your view, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes. And he sacrificed a great deal to give to his Government information about the operation of the Communist conspiracy.

Now you have an opportunity, after stigmatizing him in that way, to say whether or not he lied in any respect. He was under oath before this committee. You have the opportunity now to say whether he lied in any respect insofar as the testimony concerns you.

Mr. MACLEOD. I am not grateful for the opportunity, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. I understand.

Mr. MACLEOD. You offered it so solicitously I thought you might expect me to be grateful.

Mr. SCHERER. No, I didn't expect it. Frankly, I expected you to invoke the fifth amendment. That is what I expected you to do.

Mr. MACLEOD. Why emphasize the fifth, Mr. Scherer?

Is that a particularly smelly part of the Constitution to you?

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MACLEOD. Is there a question?

Mr. SCHERER. So there is no question as to the status of the record, is there anything Mr. Schoemehl said about you in his testimony before this committee that was untrue?

Mr. MACLEOD. I haven't the faintest idea what Mr. Schoemehl said in the first place. But, regardless of what he said, I wouldn't dignify it by an answer. And I certainly would assert all constitutional privileges.

Mr. SCHERER. Without knowing what Mr. Schoemehl said, you are telling us you would refuse to answer any questions with reference to his testimony? Without knowing what he said?

Mr. MACLEOD. Apparently you didn't think it was necessary that I know, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Was Mr. Schoemehl lying to this committee when he said that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MACLEOD. I don't know what Mr. Schoemehl said.

Mr. SCHERER. I am telling you then if you don't know, that he——

Mr. MACLEOD. With respect to any such testimony I reassert all of the constitutional objections previously advanced.

Mr. SCHERER. Would you let me finish my question? Because I didn't finish it. And then you can answer.

Was Mr. Schoemehl lying when he told this committee under oath that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MACLEOD. In reply to that question I reassert all of the constitutional considerations which I think are involved in that question and which privilege me from answering the question, entitle me to refuse to answer it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schoemehl testified that he attended what was known as the Basic Training Institute of the Communist Party, which is a different school from that which Mr. Younglove was speaking of, and that, according to his recollection, you made one lecture at that school. Do you recall having done so?

Mr. MACLEOD. Well, there again it is one of those situations where, strong as the temptation may be, I will have to invoke my constitutional privileges.

Mr. TAVENNER. And refuse to answer?

Mr. MACLEOD. And refuse to answer for all of the reasons previously specified.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you do so refuse?

Mr. MACLEOD. And I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to read to you a short portion of the testimony which followed his description of the school:

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion, after the conduct of this school, to attend Communist Party meetings with Douglas MacLeod?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I can't remember any certain specific time, because I met them—it was just the usual thing, you know. There was nothing unusual about meeting them. And at this time it wouldn't register with me when I saw them after that because I met them from time to time, on the streets and otherwise. It would be hard for me to say because it has been over 5 years since I was in much of the activities there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Douglas MacLeod attend any meetings of the Communist Party at which you were present?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. At general membership meetings, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Were those general membership meetings closed Communist Party meetings?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. They were closed meetings, Communist Party meetings. Only Communist Party members were supposed to be there.

I would like to ask you whether or not Mr. Schoemehl is correct in stating that you attended the general membership meetings of the Communist Party after the date of this school which was in 1946.

Mr. MACLEOD. And when you read that lengthy excerpt from the testimony of your informer, sir, did you expect me to answer that question any other way than previously I answered them?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask a direction of the witness.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. MACLEOD. And the reply is identical to the previous replies, in that I invoke all of the constitutional rights previously recited.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. MacLeod, this committee has at various places in the country made special inquiry and investigation regarding the practice of signing non-Communist affidavits by employees of various labor unions required under the Taft-Hartley Act to sign such affidavits.

I desire to make it plain I am not asking you to give this committee information regarding any client that you have represented in any such proceeding involving one of those affidavits, but I do want to ask you whether or not you have any knowledge of the practice of the Communist Party in advising its members how to use this non-Communist affidavit as required by law.

Mr. MACLEOD. Mr. Tavenner, I think that is an insinuation framed as a question. I think it is an insult to me as a lawyer.

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute.

You said that is an insinuation. Is the insinuation of Mr. Tavenner correct?

Mr. MACLEOD. Are you accusing me, Congressman Scherer, of conniving at perjury?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. MACLEOD. It sounds like it.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

As I understand the question, it is whether or not you have any knowledge—

Mr. SCHERER. No.

The question was whether the insinuation he referred to, he alleges to have been made by Mr. Tavenner in the question, was correct.

Is there anything wrong with that insinuation?

Mr. MACLEOD. There is lots wrong with that insinuation.

Mr. SCHERER. Tell us what is wrong.

Mr. MACLEOD. It is an insinuation that a member of the bar might conceivably connive at perjury, which is such a fantastically remote thing from any proper legislative function of this committee that I don't see how he has the colossal nerve to ask the question.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

Mr. MACLEOD. The answer to the question is the same as all the other grounds, the full, the whole load.

Mr. MOULDER. What is your question, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was whether or not he has any knowledge of a Communist Party plan as to how non-Communist affidavits were to be prepared by persons who are members of the Communist Party and who are required by law, by virtue of their employment, to sign the non-Communist affidavit.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MACLEOD. The answer is that the question is objectionable for all the reasons previously stated, and I decline to answer for all the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party, Mr. MacLeod?

Mr. MACLEOD. Same answer; same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in New York City prior to your entering the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. MACLEOD. Same answer; same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time about which I have not made specific inquiry?

Mr. MACLEOD. Same answer; same reasons.



Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Tavenner, may I inquire?

As I recall the testimony of Mr. Schoemehl there was some testimony on his part concerning the meetings held at headquarters on Grand Avenue in St. Louis where lectures and speeches were made and advice given by Mr. MacLeod as to the conduct of members of the Communist Party.

Do you recall such testimony?

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe Mr. Younglove is the person who gave the testimony to which you are referring.

Mr. Schoemehl testified that Mr. MacLeod lectured on one occasion. He did not state anything about the content of his lecture.

Mr. MOULDER. That was Jones.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir. That is my recollection of it.

I could be in error.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you have any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. I have no questions.

The witness is excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Chairman, may I make several observations?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to say that during the absence yesterday of the committee in Washington, the staff endeavored to continue with its investigation here, and found that certain labor unions have been very active in attempting to solve problems relating to communism. And the staff felt quite reassured because of representations made by representatives from Local 25, United Auto Workers, CIO, of their alertness to this whole subject we have been discussing, and hearing evidence at this hearing.

I would like also to say to the committee at this time that because of the shortness of time, the interruptions the committee has had, we have not been able to present to you all of the witnesses. I think I should say that two witnesses were excused because of a death in the family, at least two because of serious illness according to doctors' certificates, and that there have been some witnesses we just haven't had an opportunity to call, haven't had time to reach.

I do not know what decision the committee may want to make after returning to Washington and studying these matters, as to whether or not any of those not called will be called. But I thought the record should show that at this point.

Mr. MOULDER. At future hearings here in St. Louis?

Mr. TAVENNER. Or any other place. I am not sure. I am not ready to make any recommendations to you about it.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you have a statement to make, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Tavenner's statement to the effect that the labor unions here in St. Louis are alerted to the problem makes me say that I think that one of the most significant and important developments resulting in the hearings here in St. Louis was the testimony relating to the Communist Party attempts to colonize industry.

While this committee has been in existence for many years, it was not until a year and a half ago or possibly 2 years ago that the com-

mittee learned for the first time of one of the activities of the Communist Party, namely, the colonization of industry.

Many people do not understand what is meant by the colonization of industry.

What we have heard during these 5 days in St. Louis shows that such attempts were made in this area. I refer to the testimony taken in Michigan 2 years ago that showed conclusively that the Communist Party was taking persons highly educated and highly trained from the East Coast and sending them into the automobile and other industries in the State of Michigan to work at menial jobs.

It showed that these intellectuals who went to Michigan at the direction of the Communist Party in making application for positions in those industries falsely represented their educational background.

We found Communists who had master's degrees who, in their applications, stated that their education consisted only of high school or elementary training.

When they finally obtained a position through making such false allegations, a position either on the assembly line or some other menial task, they did not disclose to their fellow workmen that they had been sent there by the Communist Party. They did not disclose their educational background, and did not disclose the fact that they were there on the assembly line in an effort to indoctrinate their fellow workmen into some of the philosophy of the Communist conspiracy.

There were at least 5 witnesses, as I recall, who appeared before us here in St. Louis, 3 of whom, I believe, had master's degrees, 2 of them from Washington University, who followed the same pattern as was followed by Communists in Michigan, as I have just described.

These individuals who appeared before us here and, who were highly trained, made similar applications to industries in this area, failing to disclose their educational background in the manner that I have described was done in the State of Michigan.

So I think it is a fine thing if the unions here in this community are alerted as a result of that testimony. To that extent at least I feel these hearings were worth while.

Mr. MOULDER. I am sure the unions will take diligent and effective notice of such influence in their organizations.

Now that we have come to the close of this hearing I want the record to show that the Committee on Un-American Activities is deeply appreciative of the action taken by the Honorable Roy W. Harper, judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, in making this splendid courtroom available to the Congress for the conduct of these hearings.

We are not unmindful of the fact that this action on his part was accompanied by considerable sacrifice and inconvenience, necessitating, as it did, the holding of court and trial of cases in quarters not well adapted for those purposes. He has contributed materially to the success of the hearings and the comfort and convenience of the committee and its staff.

I desire also to take this opportunity to thank Omar L. Schnatmeier, United States marshal, and the competent members of his staff; the superintendent who is in charge of the Federal Building, Edwin R.

Hoelsher; and the chief of police, Col. Jeremiah O'Connell, and the capable members of his staff for the invaluable service they have rendered the committee in connection with this hearing.

The evidence produced during the hearings in St. Louis and in other industrial cities shows the need for legislation to compel and assure stricter and more extensive measures and regulations by all industries against possible Communist sabotage and work stoppages, especially in those industries engaged in vital defense production under contracts with our Government.

Other valuable information has been submitted before the committee during this week which shows the methods used by Communists in their efforts to infiltrate and influence certain organizations and occupational segments of our population.

We believe the testimony presented here corroborates similar testimony secured in other cities showing that the Communist Party of the United States is a part of an international conspiracy to promote the policy of a foreign power which seeks to control and dominate the world.

All of the evidence presented here will be printed and carefully studied by the committee, and our report and recommendation will be made by the committee as soon as possible.

Last, but by no means least, we sincerely emphasize our congratulations to the press for the valuable and excellent and objective reporting coverage which they have provided during the hearings this week in St. Louis.

Thank you very much.

The committee will be adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 6:20 p. m., Friday, June 8, 1956, the subcommittee was recessed subject to the call of the Chair; there being present at the time of the recess Representatives Moulder and Scherer.)

# INDEX

## INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Aukamp, Helen, also known as Dorothy. (See Sage, Helen.)	
Baldwin, Beane C	5038
Baris, Irl B	4825, 4864, 5069
Barker, Dave	4734
Becker, Jack	5041, 5042
Benjamin, Herbert	5031, 5034, 5046
Benjamin, Lillian	5046
Bentley, Elizabeth	5068
Berger, Sadelle (Mrs. Sidney Berger)	4861, 4878, 4880, 4882
Berger, Sidney	4831
Browder, Earl	4835, 4836, 4843
Buckich, Andrew	4839, 4858
Budenz, Louis	5032
Bush (father of Margaret Bush Wilson)	5044
Carpenter, Zollie C	4734, 4850, 4869-4876 (testimony), 4926, 4961
Chaunt, Peter	4735
Chinnici, Sam	4840
Cohn, Joseph	5004, 5017, 5026
Cohn, Roy	5061
Cook, Rudolph B	5019
Cooper, James	439
Cortor, William W	4724-4757 (testimony), 4758-4760 (testimony), 4779, 4795, 4796, 4816, 4826, 4830, 4878, 4884, 4899, 5003, 5067, 5068, 5070
Cuttier, Marie	4859
Davis, William E	4739, 4748, 4756, 4895-4898 (testimony)
Davison, Leslie S	4793-4794 (testimony)
Day, Harvey John	4750, 4751, 4753, 4818-4824 (testimony), 4961, 4962, 5049, 5050
Decavitch, Victor	4742
Derman, Isaac	5071
Derman, Sol	4751, 4984, 4985, 5070-5072 (testimony)
Dolan, Graham	5019
Douglas, Leonard	5043
Duclos, Jacques	4836
Drew, Carolyn (Mrs. Alfred Wagenknecht)	4726, 4735, 4749
Eckert, Kenneth	5018, 5019
Edsell, Harold	4839, 4858
Eisler, Gerhart	4766, 4974
England, Louis K	4839, 4962
Evans, Shepard R	5058, 5065
Falzone, Clifford A	5072
Field, Ralph	5030, 5031
Fiering, Clara Wernick (Mrs. Henry Fiering)	4726, 4735, 4743
Fiering, Henry	4725, 4726, 4734, 4735, 4739, 4740, 4743
Fischer, Louis	5030
Fite, Anna	4859
Fite, Joe	4859
Forrest, Dorothy (Mrs. James Forrest)	4751, 4954, 4959, 4998
Forrest, James	4782, 4946, 4954, 4958, 4959, 4990, 4997, 4998, 5046, 5047
Forrester, Paul	4844, 4845, 4846
Foster, William Z	4848
Friedman, AL	4859, 4860, 4893, 5037
Glazer, Sidney M	5070
Gold, Ben	4999



	Page
Gowgiel, Florence	4756, 4757
Granich, Grace	4922
Grimm, Tom	4856
Hall, Annabelle (Mrs. Gilbert Harold Hall)	4840
Hall, Gilbert Harold	4751, 4840, 4855, 4856, 4924, 4962, 4986, 4940-4943 (testimony)
Hammaek, Loyal	4966-4971 (testimony), 5013
Harap, Louis	5062, 5063
Hardy, George V. L.	4769, 4775, 4776, 4971-4977 (testimony)
Hardyman, Hugh	5053, 5054
Hauber, Elsie	4759, 4779, 5003
Haug, Fred	4743
Haug, Marie (Mrs. Fred Haug)	4743
Hecht, Julius	4746, 5069-5079 (testimony)
Hecht, Thelma (Mrs. Julius Hecht)	4745, 4746, 4750, 4751, 4754, 4780, 4825-4828 (testimony), 5070
Heffner, Olive (Mrs. Roger Heffner)	4837, 4839, 4893
Heffner, Roger	4837, 4839, 4962, 4963
Hennelly, Mark M.	4889
Hogan, Bob	4856, 4857
Holland, Ida (Mrs. William Holland)	4755, 4780, 4899-4902 (testimony)
Holland, William Henry	4753, 4778, 4779, 4808-4818 (testimony), 4833, 4899
Hudson, Romey	4748, 4751, 4779, 4844, 4859, 4945-4946 (testimony), 4958, 4997, 5014, 5015, 5054
Jans, Paul	5032, 5037
Jones, Obadiah	4981-4991 (testimony)
Kendle (or Tendle), Simon	4751
Kern, Joe	4744
Khokhlov, Nikolai	4738, 4862, 4863, 4937
Kimmel, George	4726, 4967-4970, 5004-5013 (testimony), 5017, 5019, 5024, 5026-5027 (testimony)
Kimmel, Louis	4726, 4734, 4757, 4830, 4963
Kirkendall, Kermit M.	4740, 4741
Klein, Joseph	4852
Kling, Ann Yasgur	4844, 4845, 4912-4940 (testimony), 4953, 4954, 4994, 5046, 5047
Koch, Ray	4731, 4732, 4781, 4930, 4946, 4953, 4957, 4958, 4959, 4967, 4969, 4979, 4997, 4998, 5013, 5046
Koritz, Philip	5006, 5007, 5062
Kozak, Joseph	4839, 4857, 5033, 5037
Krooks, Paul	4839
Larson, Whirlwind	4852, 4853
Leach, Orville	4734, 4746, 4779, 4864-4869 (testimony)
Logsdon, Bob	5045
Londe, Dr. Sol	4749, 4889-4894 (testimony), 4933-4936, 4960, 4961, 4985
Londe, Mrs. Sol	4933, 4934, 4960
MacLeod, Carolyn (Mrs. Douglas MacLeod)	4835, 4837, 4838
MacLeod, Douglas	4818, 4837, 4838, 4842, 4954, 4955, 4957, 4986, 4987, 5043, 5044, 5060, 5061, 5071, 5072-5082 (testimony).
Manewitz, Esther	4856
Manewitz, Fanny (Mrs. Sam Manewitz)	4856
Manewitz, Irma	5046, 5049, 5050
Manewitz, Robert	4727, 4731, 4733, 4745, 4746, 4747, 4843, 4856, 4953, 4954, 4959, 4998, 5046, 5049, 5050
Manewitz, Sam	4856
Mariz, Frank (Maritz)	4751
Maschoff, Otto	4734, 4780
Massingale, William	4760, 4780, 4844, 4850, 4963, 4964, 4983, 5039
McKenzie, Howard	4738
Medina, Harold R., Judge	4847
Mertz, Harry	4850
Metcalf, Robert M.	4742
Miller, Bruce	4752, 4839, 4964

	Page
Miller, Laura (Mrs. Bruce Miller)-----	4752, 4839, 4841, 4964
Miller, Otto-----	4726, 4727
Montoya, Alfredo-----	5019
Moore, James-----	4964
Moore, James Ted-----	4835, 4839, 4859, 4964
Moore, Agnes (Mrs. James Ted Moore)-----	4839
Morris, George-----	4789
Morgan-----	4845
Morton, Anthony-----	5019
Murphy, Al Marcus-----	4731,
4732, 4823, 4843, 4954, 4959, 4979, 4984, 4998, 5044,	5045
Murphy, Marcus. (See Murphy, Al Marcus.)	
Musiel, Helen-----	4734,
4837, 4843, 4850, 4927-4929, 4946, 4954, 4958, 4959, 4964, 4984,	
4993-5000 (testimony), 4997, 5031, 5033, 5036, 5049.	
Myers, Frederick-----	4738
Nearing, Scott-----	4967
Nissen, Sol S.-----	4749, 4753, 4769, 4780, 4794-4798 (testimony)
Nordman, John-----	4734, 4746
Ober, Bebe-----	4741
Oberfeld, Viola-----	4772, 4976
Oser, Marcella (Mrs. Nathan Oser, nee Sexauer)---	4842, 4843, 4847, 4954, 5047
Oser, Nathan-----	4842, 4954, 4959, 4998, 5047
Paige, Ruth-----	4837, 4838
Pappademos, Ella Mae (nee Posey)-----	4755,
4983, 4984, 4987, 5014, 5015, 5051-5058 (testimony)	
Pasche, Victor-----	4859, 4882
Pavlich, John-----	4840
Payne, Forrest-----	4741
Payne, James-----	4734, 4876-4883 (testimony)
Pearson, Eula Mae (Mrs. Herman Pearson)-----	4839, 4965
Pearson, Herman-----	4965
Perez, Anton-----	4858
Perkins, Clara (Mrs. Haven Perkins)-----	4843, 4954, 4955,
4983, 5058-5064 (testimony), 5061	
Perkins, Haven-----	4843, 4954, 4955, 4983, 4983, 5061, 5065-5068 (testimony).
Philbrick, Herbert A.-----	4773, 4906
Phillips, A. E.-----	4738
Posey, Ella Mae. (See Pappademos, Ella Mae.)	
Reed, Herbert-----	4741
Richardson, Edwin Leslie-----	4778, 4902-4912 (testimony), 4982
Ring, Melvin-----	4837, 4839
Ring, Naomi (Mrs. Melvin Ring)-----	4837, 4842, 5047, 5048
Robinson, Reid-----	5019
Rossen, Johnny-----	4844
Rossen, Louise (Mrs. Johnny Rossen)-----	4844
Roudebush, G. S.-----	4912
Rutledge, Dr. John F.-----	5028-5051 (testimony) 5071
Sage, Helen (Mrs. James H. Sage, also known as Dorothy, nee Aukamp)---	4735,
4758, 4845, 4849, 4870, 4883-4888 (testimony), 4926, 4984	
Sage, James H.-----	4758,
4761-4784 (testimony), 4793, 4797, 4809, 4815, 4816, 4826, 4830,	
4831, 4845, 4868, 4888, 4904, 4971-4976, 4984, 4985, 5037, 5049,	
5057, 5063, 5064, 5069.	
Sanderson, Harold C.-----	5019
Schechter, Amy-----	4942
Schmidt, Marie-----	4835, 4841
Schmidt, Tom-----	4759, 4964
Schoemehl, Joseph John-----	4731,
4732, 4782, 4843, 4845, 4890, 4891, 4931-4934, 4944, 4945, 4946,	
4949-4966 (testimony), 4979 (testimony), 4995, 4996-4999, 5079,	
5080, 5082.	
Schumacher, Brockman-----	4747, 4748, 4756, 4829-4834 (testimony)
Scrotto, Roy-----	4840
Scrotto, Russell-----	4840
Scrotto, Vera (Mrs. Russell Scrotto)-----	4840
Sentner, Antonia-----	4722

	Page
Sentner, William Jr.-----	4726, 4731, 4733, 4735, 4768, 4772, 4775, 4780, 4782, 4793, 4861, 4886, 4963, 4972, 4975, 5037, 5041, 5043, 5044
Shaw, Ralph-----	4726, 4782, 4853, 4854, 4913-4916, 4943, 4953-4955, 4990, 5020, 5021, 5033-5038, 5040, 5041, 5043, 5044, 5016, 5071.
Shaw, Sarah (Mrs. Ralph Shaw, nee Kling)-----	4726, 4953, 4958, 4997, 5033
Shryver, Katherine-----	5041, 5042, 5045, 5071
Sigerist, Dr. Henry-----	5030
Simpson (John)-----	4975
Simpson, John William-----	4753, 4798-4801 (testimony), 4803-4808 (testimony)
Siren, Felix-----	4738
Smith, Ferdinand C-----	4738
Smith, Marcelle-----	4857
Sob ll, Morton-----	5061, 5066
Stager, Waldo-----	4739, 4740
Stanford, Edna (Mrs. Richard Stanford)-----	4959
Stanford, Richard-----	4758, 4844, 4944-4945 (testimony) 4957, 4959, 4965
Starks, John-----	4739
Starks, Pearl Bernstein-----	4739, 4759, 4760, 4780
Steinberg, Bill-----	5038, 5040
Stern, Bernard W-----	5019
Strom, Barney-----	5032
Strom, Mrs. Barney-----	5033
Taylor, Garnet W-----	4761, 4883
Tendle, Simon. ( <i>See</i> Kendle, Simon.)-----	
Umstead, James-----	4858
Uphaus, Dr. Willard-----	4766, 4767, 5053
Wagenknecht, Alfred-----	4726, 4735
Walker, Hershel James-----	4756, 4859, 4991, 5000-5004 (testimony) 5014-5017 (testimony), 5045, 5054
Walsh, Patrick-----	4738, 4739
Wampler, J inus E-----	4969, 5017-5026 (testimony), 5044
Wangerin, Otto-----	4854, 4923, 4924, 4942
Waxman, Elliott-----	4753, 4754, 4755, 4779, 4784-4793 (testimony), 4795, 4817, 4965, 4986
Waxman, Loretta-----	4779
Waxman, Marilyn-----	4779
Webb, Herman-----	4854
Wernick, Clara. ( <i>See</i> Fiering, Clara Wernick.)-----	
Whitaker, Cleo-----	4856
Whitfield, Rev. Olin-----	5045
Wilburn, James-----	4748
Wilson, Charlie-----	5039, 5040
Wilson, Margaret Bush-----	5044, 5045
Witherspoon, Robert L-----	4829, 4945, 4993, 5000, 5014, 5051
Wolf-----	5043
Wolff, Frank-----	4902
Wolverson, Ray-----	4850, 4926, 5003
Wright, Morris-----	5019
Yasgur, Ann. ( <i>See</i> Kling, Ann Yasgur.)-----	
Younglove, Thomas A.-----	4834-4863 (testimony), 4882, 4884, 4885, 5002, 5003, 5067, 5068, 5078, 5080, 5082

## ORGANIZATIONS

Abraham Lincoln Brigade-----	4749, 4820, 4821
American Federation of Labor-----	4939
American Peace Crusade-----	4778, 4780, 4904, 5053
Antioch College-----	4741
Asian Pacific Conference. ( <i>See</i> Peace Conference of the Asian and Pacific Regions.)-----	
Auto Workers, United CIO, Local 25-----	5082
Basic Training Institute-----	4843, 4845, 4847, 4952, 4954, 4959, 4960, 5060
Batory, steamship-----	4766, 4776, 4974
Civil Rights Congress, St. Louis-----	4758, 4759, 4982, 4983, 4991

## Communist Party, U. S. A.:

## Districts:

## Page

District 21 (Missouri and Arkansas) .....	4729, 4953
District committee .....	4820
Missouri .....	4726, 4847, 4848, 4967, 5031
Convention, 1945 .....	5034
Kansas City, railroad group .....	4924
St. Louis .....	4728, 4730, 5033
Automotive branch .....	4752, 4753, 4759
Club within Century Electric Co. ....	4729
Club within Emerson Electric Co. ....	4729, 4731, 4733, 4736
Club within St. Louis Car Co. ....	4729
Club within Wagner Electric Co. ....	4729
Construction workers group .....	4750, 4751
Douglass Club .....	4851
Haldane (student) Club .....	4732
Harriet Tubman Club .....	4850
Machinist unit .....	4859
Negro Commission .....	4732
North Side section .....	4732, 4956
Out-State Committee .....	4732, 4781
Packinghouse group .....	4850
Professional section (group) .....	4732,
4862, 4932, 4933, 4944, 4950, 4985, 5032, 5033, 5047, 5048	
Railroad group .....	4986
Review Commission .....	4732, 4946, 4950, 4957-4959, 4997
Roosevelt Club .....	4851, 4952
Sacco-Vanzetti Club .....	4857
South Side group .....	4751, 4752, 4925
South Side section, shoe group .....	4850, 4856, 4857
Tom Paine Club .....	4758, 4851, 4856, 5035
West End Club .....	4861, 4862, 5059, 5058
West Side group .....	4728, 4732, 4746, 4925
Youth Commission .....	4732
State Board .....	4731, 4851, 4962, 5003, 5035, 5037
State Committee. (See Communist Party, Missouri, State board.)	
National Committee .....	4848
Waterfront section .....	4736, 4737
Communist Political Association, Missouri:	
Convention, 1944 .....	5034
St. Louis .....	4835
South Side Club .....	4835, 4841, 4846
Congress of Industrial Organizations .....	4939
St. Louis Council .....	4860, 4861
Congress of the Peoples for Peace, Vienna, December 1952 .....	5073
Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, United .....	4727,
4734, 4737, 4743, 4871, 4872, 5042, 5043	
Dayton, Ohio .....	4725
District 7 (Ohio) .....	4739, 4740, 4742
District 8 .....	4879, 4886
Amalgamated Local (S28), St. Louis .....	4729, 4733, 4737
Local 813 .....	4877
Local 1102 .....	4729, 4737
Local 1104 .....	4729, 5059, 5060
Local 1108 .....	4729, 4737
Emerson Electric Co. ....	4884-4887
Ford Motor Co., St. Louis, Lincoln-Mercury Division .....	4752
Freedom of the Press Committee of St. Louis. (See National Committee for Freedom of the Press.)	
Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers of America, United, CIO, St. Louis .....	4851
General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y. ....	4852
General Motors Corp.:	
St. Louis .....	4752
Chevrolet division .....	4752, 4753
Chevrolet Shell .....	4752, 4753
Fisher Body division .....	4752-4754
Independent Progressive Party .....	5028, 5029



	Page
International Labor Defense.....	4951
International Workers Order.....	4728
Joseph Weydemeyer School of Social Science.....	4959, 4960
Labor Youth League.....	4908
Laclede Gas Light Co.....	4852
League of Struggle for Negro Rights.....	4951
Machinists, International Association of, Local 2040.....	4877, 4880
Maritime Union of America, National.....	4737, 4738, 4744
St. Louis.....	4737, 4738
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, International Union of.....	5005, 5017, 5019
Executive board.....	5017
Local 883.....	5006, 5027
St. Genevieve, Mo.....	4968-4970
Mississippi Lime Co.....	4967, 4968
Missouri Citizens for Wallace (Committee).....	5029, 5041-5043
National Citizens Political Action Committee.....	5029, 5037, 5038, 5040
Missouri.....	5037, 5038
National Committee for Freedom of the Press.....	4791
Freedom of the Press Committee of St. Louis.....	4788, 4790, 4791
Philadelphia.....	4791
National Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell in the Rosenberg Case.....	5063
National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.....	4760,
4982, 5007, 5061, 5062	4983
St. Louis Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.....	4892
National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.....	4891
St. Louis.....	4933, 5074
National Lawyers Guild.....	4747, 4755, 4756, 5001
National Negro Labor Council, St. Louis.....	5053
Peace Conference of the Asian and Pacific Regions.....	
Philadelphia Freedom of the Press Committee. (See National Committee for Freedom of the Press, Philadelphia.)	
Progressive Citizens of America.....	5029, 5040, 5041
Progressive Party.....	5046
Missouri.....	5029, 5042, 5043, 5045, 5072
Kansas City.....	5047
St. Louis.....	4985
State Committee.....	5003
Railroad Terminal Association.....	4855
Robins & Myers Electric Co.....	4741, 4743
Save Our Sons Committee.....	4756, 4757
St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee.....	4747-4751, 4755, 4757, 4759, 4790
St. Louis Freedom of the Press Committee. (See National Committee for Freedom of the Press; Freedom of the Press Committee of St. Louis.)	
Stockholm Appeal. (See World Peace Appeal.)	
Trade Union Unity League.....	4939, 5019
Unemployed Councils.....	4951
University of Colorado.....	4773
Vanguard Book Shop.....	4728, 4731
Washington University, St. Louis.....	4783, 4815, 4832, 4976, 4985
Communist Club.....	4781
Workers Ex-Servicemen's League.....	4951
World Federation of Trade Unions.....	4939, 4941
World Peace Appeal (also referred to as Stockholm Appeal).....	4941
World Peace Congress, Second Congress.....	4765, 4776, 4974
World Peace Council.....	5053
Young Communist League:	
Missouri:	
St. Louis.....	4724-4726, 4735, 4920
University of Missouri Branch.....	4917, 4918
Ohio, Antioch College Branch.....	4741
Young Progressives of America.....	4908

## PUBLICATIONS

Daily Worker.....	4789, 4790, 4791
"Don't Try To Lose Us. Let's Talk Some About Civil Rights" ---	5014, 5054
Jewish Life.....	5063
St. Louis Defender, The.....	4750, 4790













BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05706 3230

	a g	3231
<u>skip</u>	c d e f	3232
	j	3233
	h i j k	3234
	i	3235

Rocky Mtns pts 1-7  
Passports pls 1-4  
Propaganda pt 1  
St. Louis pls 1-4  
Save Our Sons





